arXiv:1411.6173v1 [math.OA] 22 Nov 2014

# FREENESS AND THE TRANSPOSES OF UNITARILY INVARIANT RANDOM MATRICES

JAMES A. MINGO[(*)] AND MIHAI POPA[(*)(**)]

Abstract. We show that real second order freeness appears in the study of Haar unitary and unitarily invariant random matrices when transposes are also considered. In particular we obtain the unexpected result that a unitarily invariant random matrix will be asymptotically free from its transpose.

## 1. Introduction

Free independence, introduced by D.-V. Voiculescu, is an analogue of classical independence suited for non-commuting random variables. If two random variables $a$ and $b$ are freely independent, there is a universal rule, independent of $a$ and $b$, for computing the mixed moments of $a$ and $b$ from just the moments of $a$ and the moments of $b$. This has been a very useful tool in random matrix theory as independent ensembles are asymptotically free, provided that at least one of them is unitarily, or orthogonally, invariant; see [V$_1$], [V$_2$], [AGZ], [MSS].

The study of fluctuations of the distribution of eigenvalues around their mean, for various ensembles of random matrices, goes back to the work of Dyson (see [D$_1$], [D$_2$]). These fluctuations can be often described by the use of fluctuation moments. Second order freeness was developed by Mingo and Speicher (see [MS], [MST]) to give a universal rule for computing mixed fluctuation moments in terms of the individual fluctuation moments. Random variables are second order free when this universal rule holds. It was shown, in [MSS] that, as in the case of Voiculescu's freeness, independent ensembles are asymptotically second order free provided that at least one of them is unitarily invariant.

In the case of second order freeness differences in the symmetries of the matrices become apparent. Emily Redelmeier [R] showed that for

* Research supported by a Discovery Grant from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

** Research supported by the Natural Science Foundation of China Grant No. 11150110456, and the Romanian National Authority for Scientific Research, CNCS UEFISCDI, Project Number PN-II-ID-PCE-2011-3-0119.




FIGURE 1. On the left we have sampled $U + U^*$ with $U$ a Haar distributed random unitary matrix. One can see that the eigenvalue distribution converges to the arcsine law (solid line) on the interval $[2, -2]$. On the right we have the distribution of the eigenvalues of $U + U^* + (U + U^*)^t$. converging to the Kesten-Mckay law with two degrees of freedom (solid line).

the GOE, real Wishart matrices, and real Ginibre matrices a different universal rule was needed. In the first order case, i.e. Voiculescu's freeness, no difference between real and complex matrices is observed. In the second order case new terms appeared. Redelmeier called this new universal rule *real second order freeness*. In [MP] the authors showed that independent and orthogonally invariant matrices are asymptotically real second order free. Since the orthogonal group is a subgroup of the unitary group, both rules apply in the case of unitarily invariant ensembles.

In order to resolve the discrepancy between the two rules the authors were led to examine the role played by the transpose in random matrix theory. This lead to the surprising fact that many ensembles of random matrices are asymptotically free from their transposes. The goal of this paper is to show that for unitarily invariant ensembles the transpose does produce asymptotic freeness (see Corollary 29 and Proposition 38).

Let us illustrate this with a simple example, see Figure 1. Let $U$ be a $N \times N$ Haar distributed random unitary matrix. Let $U^*$ denote the conjugate transpose of $U$, and $U^t$ the transpose of $U$. The eigenvalue distribution of $U + U^*$ converges to the arcsine law, $\mu_1$, on $[2, -2]$ (i.e. with density $1/(\pi\sqrt{4 - t^2})$). If we take the free additive convolution of $\mu_1$ with itself we get $\mu_2 = \mu_1 \boxplus \mu_1$, the Kesten-McKay law with two degrees of freedom. Since the eigenvalue distribution of $U+U^*+(U+U^*)^t$ appears to converge to $\mu_2$ are led to expect that $U + U^*$ is asymptotically free from its transpose. We shall prove a much more general result, namely one needs the ensemble to be unitarily invariant. Besides

this introduction, the paper contains 3 more sections: Section 2 states definitions and some preliminary results, Section 3 addresses the relation between Haar unitary random matrices and their transposes and Section 4 contains the main results, regarding ensembles of unitarily invariant random matrices.

## 2. Preliminaries

2.1. **Notations.** Let $A$ be a $N \times N$ matrix, where $N \geq 2$. We will denote its non-normalized trace by $\mathrm{Tr}(A)$, and its normalized trace by $\mathrm{tr}(A)$, i.e. $\mathrm{tr}(A) = \frac{1}{N}\mathrm{Tr}(A)$. Also we will denote by by $A^t$ the transpose of the matrix $A$. We will use the notation $A^{(-1)} = A^t$ and $A^{(1)} = A$. We need to extend this notation to allow taking entry-wise complex conjugates. Let $\overline{A} = (A^*)^t$ and for $(\epsilon, \eta) \in \{-1, 1\}^2$ let $A^{(\epsilon,\eta)}$ be defined as follows:

$$A^{(1,1)} = A, \qquad A^{(-1,1)} = A^t, \qquad A^{(1,-1)} = \overline{A}, \qquad A^{(-1,-1)} = A^*.$$

The first variable indicates whether or not a transpose is taken and the second whether or not the complex conjugate of each entry is taken. We shall use the notation that $-(\epsilon, \eta) = (-\epsilon, -\eta)$. Note that then $(A^{(\epsilon,\eta)})^* = A^{-(\epsilon,\eta)}$. For a complex number $z$ let $z^{(1)} = z$ and $z^{(-1)} = \overline{z}$. Note that this is a slight abuse of notation because a complex number can also be regarded as a $1 \times 1$ matrix. However as we are mainly interested large matrices this will not cause any confusion. Then the $(i, j)$ entry of $A^{(\epsilon,\eta)}$ is $a_{ij}^{(\eta)}$ if $\epsilon = 1$ and $a_{ji}^{(\eta)}$ if $\epsilon = -1$.

For a positive integer $n$, let $[n]$ be the ordered set $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ and $\mathcal{P}(n)$ be the set of all partitions of $[n]$. By $k_r(X_1, \ldots, X_r)$ we mean the $r^{th}$ classical cumulant of the random variables $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_r$. Recall from [NS, p. 191] that these are defined implicitly by the moment cumulant relation

$$\mathrm{E}(X_1 \cdots X_r) = \sum_{\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{P}(r)} k_{\mathcal{U}}(X_1, \ldots, X_r) \tag{1}$$

where $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{P}(r)$ and

$$k_{\mathcal{U}}(X_1, \ldots, X_r) = \prod_{\substack{B \in \mathcal{U} \\ B = \{i_1, \ldots, i_p\}}} k_p(X_{i_1}, \ldots, X_{i_p}).$$

If $\mathcal{A}$ is a unital algebra and $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2, \ldots, \mathcal{A}_s$ are unital subalgebras of $\mathcal{A}$, we will say that a $n$-tuple $(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ of elements from $\mathcal{A}_1 \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{A}_s$ is *alternating* if, for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ we have that $a_i \in \mathcal{A}_{j_i}$ with $j_i \neq j_{i+1}$. If in addition $j_n \neq j_1$, we say that the $n$-tuple is *cyclically alternating*.

If $\varphi : \mathcal{A} \to \mathbb{C}$ is a state, i.e. $\varphi$ is linear and $\varphi(1) = 1$, we say $a \in \mathcal{A}$ is *centered* if $\varphi(a) = 0$.

Finally, by $\mathbb{C}\langle x_1, \ldots, x_r\rangle$ we will denote the algebra of polynomials with complex coefficients in the non-commuting variables $x_1, \ldots, x_r$.

2.2. **Second order distributions and second order freeness.**

We consider a *non-commutative probability space* $(\mathcal{A}, \varphi)$, that is $\mathcal{A}$ is a unital algebra over $\mathbb{C}$ and a state $\varphi : \mathcal{A} \to \mathbb{C}$. For $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in \mathcal{A}$ the mixed moments of $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ are the values $\varphi(x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_k})$ where $1 \leq i_l \leq n$ for $1 \leq l \leq k$. The elements $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ are *free* if the the unital subalgebras $\mathcal{A}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{A}_n$ are free where $\mathcal{A}_i$ is the unital subalgebra generated by $x_i$. Unital subalgebras $\mathcal{A}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{A}_s$ of $\mathcal{A}$ are *free* if whenever we have centered and alternating elements $a_1, \ldots, a_n \in \mathcal{A}_1 \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{A}_s$, we have $\varphi(a_1 \cdots a_n) = 0$. This gives a universal rule for computing the mixed moments $\varphi(x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_k})$ in terms of the moments of each $x_i$. See [NS, Examples 5.15]. We shall often call this freeness property (introduced by of Voiculescu, [V1]) *first order freeness* to distinguish it from that of second order freeness given below.

A *second order non-commutative probability space*, $(\mathcal{A}, \varphi, \varphi_2)$, is a non-commutative probability space $(\mathcal{A}, \varphi)$ with extra structure. We first require that $\varphi$ be a tracial state, i.e. $\varphi(ab) = \varphi(ba)$ and second the existence of a bilinear functional $\varphi_2$ that gives the fluctuation moments. This means $\varphi_2 : \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A} \to \mathbb{C}$ is a bilinear functional, tracial in each variable, is such that $\varphi_2(1, a) = \varphi_2(a, 1) = 0$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$. For $x_1, \ldots, x_s \in \mathcal{A}$ the mixed fluctuation moments of $x_1, \ldots, x_s$ are the values $\varphi_2(x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_m}, x_{j_1} \cdots x_{j_n})$ with $1 \leq i_k \leq s$ and $1 \leq j_l \leq s$. Second order freeness gives a universal rule for computing the mixed fluctuation moments in terms of the moments and the fluctuation moments of each $x_i$. See [MS, Def. 6.3], where $\varphi_2$ is denoted by $\rho$.

As with first order freeness, we say that random variables $x_1, \ldots, x_s$ are second order free if the unital subalgebras $\mathcal{A}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{A}_s$ they generate are second order free. Unital subalgebras $\mathcal{A}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{A}_s$ are second order free if they are free of first order, and satisfy the following property. Given centered elements $a_1, \ldots a_m, b_1, \ldots b_n \in \mathcal{A}_1 \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{A}_s$ such that both $a_1, \ldots, a_m$ and $b_1, \ldots, b_n$ are cyclically alternating we have a rule for computing the fluctuation moments $\varphi_2(a_1 \cdots a_m, b_1 \cdots b_n)$ in terms of the moments $\varphi(a_i b_j)$. Namely for $m, n \geq 1$ with $m + n > 2$

$$\varphi_2(a_1 \cdots a_m, b_1 \cdots b_n) = \delta_{m,n} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \prod_{i=1}^{n} \varphi(a_i b_{k-i}) \tag{2}$$

where $k - i$ is interpreted modulo $n$. When $m = n = 1$ we also require $\varphi_2(a_1, b_1) = 0$ if $k_1 \neq l_1$. The expression on the right hand side of




FIGURE 2. The three spoke diagrams needed by equation (2) to evaluate $\varphi_2(a_1a_2a_3, b_1b_2b_3)$.

(2) has a simple interpretation in terms of *spoke diagrams*. We put the points $a_1,\ a_2, \ldots, a_m$ around a circle in clockwise order and the points $b_1,\ b_2, \ldots, b_n$ in counter-clockwise order around an inner circle (see Fig. 2). Equation (2) says that the universal rule for computing $\varphi_2(a_1a_2\cdots a_m, b_1b_2\cdots b_n)$ is the sum over all possible spoke diagrams. If $m \neq n$ then no spoke diagrams are possible and the sum is 0. If $m = n = 1$ then there is no reduction unless $a_1$ and $b_1$ come from different subalgebras. When $m = n \geq 2$, the fluctuation moments can be computed from certain first order moments. Note that equation (2) also means that if a spoke connects an $a_i$ to a $b_j$ and $a_i$ and $b_j$ do not come from the same subalgebra then $\varphi(a_ib_j) = 0$, since we have assumed that $a_1, \ldots, a_m$ and $b_1, \ldots, b_n$ are centered. Hence in (2) only spoke diagrams which connect elements from the same subalgebra make a non-zero contribution. When $m = n = 3$ the three terms corresponding to the three *spoke* diagrams are shown in Figure 2.

A *real second order non-commutative probability space*, $(\mathcal{A}, \varphi, \varphi_2, t)$, is a non-commutative probability space $(\mathcal{A}, \varphi, \varphi_2)$ with a transpose $a \mapsto a^t$ (a linear map with $(ab)^t = b^ta^t$). We assume that $\varphi(a^t) = \varphi(a)$ and $\varphi_2(a^t, b) = \varphi_2(a, b^t) = \varphi_2(a, b)$.

We say that random variables $x_1, \ldots, x_s$ in a real second order non-commutative probability space, $(\mathcal{A}, \varphi, \varphi_2, t)$, are *real second order free* if the unital subalgebras $\mathcal{A}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{A}_s$ they generate are real second order free. Unital subalgebras $\mathcal{A}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{A}_s$ are *real second order free* if they are free of first order and satisfy the following extension of equation (2). Given centered elements $a_1, \ldots a_m, b_1, \ldots b_n \in \mathcal{A}_1 \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{A}_s$ such that both $a_1, \ldots, a_m$ and $b_1, \ldots, b_n$ are cyclically alternating we have a rule for computing the fluctuation moments $\varphi_2(a_1 \cdots a_m, b_1 \cdots b_n)$ in terms of the moments $\varphi(a_ib_j)$ and $\varphi(a_ib_j^t)$. Namely for $m, n \geq 1$ such




FIGURE 3. The three reversed spoke diagrams needed by equation (3) to evaluate $\varphi_2(a_1a_2a_3, b_1b_2b_3)$ in the case of real second order freeness.

that $m+n>2$

$$\begin{aligned}(3)\qquad &\varphi_2(a_1\cdots a_m, b_1\cdots b_n)\\ &= \delta_{m,n}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\prod_{i=1}^{n}\varphi(a_ib_{k-i}) + \delta_{m,n}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\prod_{i=1}^{n}\varphi(a_ib_{k+i}^t)\end{aligned}$$

where $k+i$ and $k-i$ are interpreted modulo $n$. When $m=n=1$ we also require $\varphi_2(a_1,b_1)=0$ if $k_1\neq l_1$. The right hand side of (3) also has an interpretation in terms of spoke diagrams. The first term is the same as for second order freeness. The second term on the right hand side also has an interpretation in terms of *reversed spoke diagrams*. We put the points $a_1,\ a_2,\ldots,a_m$ around a circle in clockwise order and the points $b_1^t,\ b_2^t,\ldots,b_n^t$ in clockwise order around an inner circle (see Fig. 3). Equation (3) says that the universal rule for computing $\varphi_2(a_1a_2\cdots a_m, b_1b_2\cdots b_n)$ is the sum of terms corresponding to the *spoke* diagrams in Figure 2 *plus* the additional terms coming from the reversed spoke diagrams in Fig. 3.

When these universal rules only hold asymptotically we have what is called *asymptotic freeness*.

**Definition 1.** Suppose that for each $N$ we have a set of $s$ $N\times N$ random matrices $\{A_{N,1}, A_{N,2},\ldots A_{N,s}\}$ and denote by $\mathcal{A}$ the ensemble $\coprod_{N\geq 1}\{A_{N,1}, A_{N,2},\ldots A_{N,s}\}$ and by $\mathcal{A}^t$ the ensemble $\coprod_{N\geq 1}\{A_{N,1}^t, A_{N,2}^t, \ldots A_{N,s}^t\}$.

(**1**) We say that the ensemble $\mathcal{A}$ has the *bounded cumulants property* if for all polynomials $p_1,p_2,p_3,\ldots$ from the algebra $\mathbb{C}\langle x_1,x_2,\ldots,x_s\rangle$ and for integers $k\geq 1$, denoting

$$W_{N,k} = p_k(A_{N,1}, A_{N,2},\ldots A_{N,s})$$

we have that:

$(i)$ $\sup_N |\,\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{tr}(W_{N,i}))| < \infty$, for all $i$

$(ii)$ $\sup_N |k_r(\mathrm{Tr}(W_{N,1}), \mathrm{Tr}(W_{N,2}), \ldots, \mathrm{Tr}(W_{N,r}))| < \infty$ for all $r \geq 2$.

If the ensemble $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}^t$ has the bounded cumulants property, we say that $\mathcal{A}$ has the *$t$-bounded cumulants property*.

(**2**) We say that the ensemble $\mathcal{A}$ has a *second order limit distribution*, if, in the definition above, conditions $(i)$ and $(ii)$ are replaced by

$(i')$ $\lim_{N\to\infty} |\,\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{tr}(W_{N,i}))|$ exists and it is finite for all $i$.

$(ii')$ $\lim_{N\to\infty} k_2(\mathrm{Tr}(W_{N,1}), \mathrm{Tr}(W_{N,2}))$ exists and it is finite.

$(iii')$ $\lim_{N\to\infty} k_r(\mathrm{Tr}(W_{N,1}), \ldots, \mathrm{Tr}(W_{N,r})) = 0$ for all $r \geq 3$.

If $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}^t$ has a second order limit distribution, we say that $\mathcal{A}$ has a *second order limit $t$-distribution*. If only the condition ( $i'$ ) is satisfied, then the ensemble $\mathcal{A}$ will be said to have a *limit distribution*.

*Example* 2. It is easy to construct ensembles of random matrices with a second order limit distribution, but no second order limit $t$-distribution (see also [CS, §5]). Consider $\mathcal{A} = \{A_N\}_{N\geq 1}$, with

$$A_N = [i^k \cdot \delta_{l-k,1}]_{k,l=1}^N,$$

i.e. all entries of $A_N$ are zero, except for the $(k, k+1)$-entries (on the diagonal above the main one), which are equal to $i^k$ (here $i$ is the complex number, $i^2 = -1$ ). Then $\mathrm{tr}(A_N^p) = 0$ for all positive integers $p$, but $\lim_{N\to\infty} \mathrm{tr}(A_N \cdot A_N^t)$ does not exist.

Throughout the rest of the paper, since all matrices appearing in an expression will always have the same dimension, we will omit the first index, $N$, when writing matrices from an ensemble, i.e. we will write $A_1, A_2, A_2$ for $A_{N,1}, A_{N,2}, A_{N,3}$.

**Definition 3.** Let $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, \ldots, A_s\}_{N\geq 1}$ and $\mathcal{B} = \{B_1, \ldots, B_p\}_{N\geq 1}$ be two ensembles of random matrices.

$(i)$ We say that $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are *asymptotically free* if $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B}$ satisfies condition $(i')$ from Definition 1, and if for any positive integer $n$ and any centered alternating $n$-tuple $(D_1, D_2, \ldots, D_n)$ from $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$, i.e. each $D_i$ is a polynomial in the matrices from one of the ensembles; , adjacent elements come from different ensembles, and $\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}(D_l)) = 0$ for all $l$; we have that

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \mathrm{E}(\mathrm{tr}(D_1 D_2 \cdots D_n)) = 0.$$

$(ii)$ We say that $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are *asymptotically complex second order free* if $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are asymptotically free, $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B}$ has a second order limit

distribution and if, for all $m, n \geq 1$ with $m+n > 2$ and all centered and cyclically alternating tuples $(C_1, \ldots, C_m)$, $(D_1, \ldots, D_n)$ of polynomials from $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$, i.e. cyclically adjacent elements come from different ensembles, and $\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}(C_j)) = \mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}(D_l)) = 0$ for all $j$ and $l$, we have that

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \{\mathrm{cov}(\mathrm{Tr}(C_1 \cdots C_m), \mathrm{Tr}(D_1 \cdots D_n)) - \delta_{m,n} \cdot \sum_{k=1}^{n} \prod_{i=1}^{n} \mathrm{E}(\mathrm{tr}(C_i \cdot D_{k-i}))\} = 0$$

where $k - i$ is interpreted modulo $n$.

(*iii*) We say that $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are *asymptotically real second order free* if $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are asymptotically free, $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B}$ has a second order limit $t$-distribution and if, for all $m, n \geq 1$ with $m + n > 2$ and all cyclically alternating tuples $(C_1, \ldots, C_m)$, $(D_1, \ldots, D_n)$ of polynomials alternating between $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$, i.e. cyclically adjacent elements come from different ensembles, such that $\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}(C_j)) = \mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}(D_l)) = 0$ ( $1 \leq j \leq m$, $1 \leq l \leq n$ ), we have that

$$(4)\quad \lim_{N\to\infty} \{\mathrm{cov}(\mathrm{Tr}(C_1 \cdots C_m), \mathrm{Tr}(D_1 \cdots D_n)) - \delta_{m,n} \cdot \sum_{k=1}^{n} [\prod_{i=1}^{n} \mathrm{E}(\mathrm{tr}(C_i \cdot D_{k-i})) + \prod_{i=1}^{n} \mathrm{E}(\mathrm{tr}(C_i \cdot D_{i-k}^t))]\} = 0$$

where again, $k - i$ and $i - k$ are interpreted modulo $n$.

It was shown in [MP], Proposition 29, that the relations above are associative for the subalgebras generated by the random variables.

*Remark* 4. In [MS] the property (*ii*) was called second order freeness as only the complex case was considered. To emphasize the difference from real second order freeness we shall in this paper call (*ii*) complex second order freeness.

If we have ensembles $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ such that for all $m, n \geq 1$ with $m+n > 2$ and all cyclically alternating tuples $(C_1, \ldots, C_m)$, $(D_1, \ldots, D_n)$ of polynomials from $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$, i.e. cyclically adjacent elements come from different ensembles, such that $\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}(C_j)) = \mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}(D_l)) = 0$ ( $1 \leq j \leq m$, $1 \leq l \leq n$ ), we have that equation(4) holds we shall say that $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ *satisfy equation* (4).

**Proposition 5.** *Let* $\{A_{1,N}, A_{2,N}, \ldots, A_{m,N}, B_{1,N}, \ldots, B_{n,N}\}_N$ *be an ensemble of random matrices with the bounded cumulants property and such that* $\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}(B_l)) = 0$ *for all* $1 \leq l \leq n$. *Then:*

(*i*) $\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}(A_1)\cdots\mathrm{Tr}(A_m)) = \mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}(A_1))\cdots\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}(A_m)) + O(N^{m-1})$; in particular, $\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}(A_1)\cdots\mathrm{Tr}(A_m)) = O(N^m)$.

(*ii*) $\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}(A_1)\cdots\mathrm{Tr}(A_m)\,\mathrm{Tr}(B_1)\cdots\mathrm{Tr}(B_n))$
$= \mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}(A_1)\cdots\mathrm{Tr}(A_m))\cdot\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}(B_1)\cdots\mathrm{Tr}(B_n)) + O(N^{m-1})$
$= O(N^m)$.

*In particular, all cumulants with entries both from* $\{\mathrm{Tr}(A_1),\ldots,\mathrm{Tr}(A_m)\}$ *and from* $\{\mathrm{Tr}(B_1),\ldots,\mathrm{Tr}(B_n)\}$ *do vanish asymptotically.*

*Proof.* For (*i*), using the moment-cumulant expansion from [NS], we have that

$$\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}(A_1)\cdots\mathrm{Tr}(A_m)) = \sum_{\pi\in\mathcal{P}(m)} k_\pi(\mathrm{Tr}(A_1),\ldots,\mathrm{Tr}(A_m)).$$

Since all cumulants of order higher than 2 are bounded, it follows that $k_\pi(\mathrm{Tr}(A_1),\ldots,\mathrm{Tr}(A_m)) = O(N^{\#\text{of singletons of }\pi})$. But elements of $\mathcal{P}(m)$ have at most $m$ singletons, with equality for $0_m$, this proves (*i*).

For (*ii*), let $\tau\in\mathcal{P}(m+n)$ be the partition with two blocks $(1,\ldots,m)$ and $(m+1,\ldots,m+n)$. Note first that the moment-cumulant expansion gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}(A_1)\cdots\mathrm{Tr}(A_m)\,\mathrm{Tr}(B_1)\cdots\mathrm{Tr}(B_n))\\
&= \sum_{\pi\in P(m+n)} k_\pi(\mathrm{Tr}(A_1),\ldots,\mathrm{Tr}(B_n))\\
&= \sum_{\substack{\pi\in P(m+n)\\ \pi<\tau}} k_\pi(\mathrm{Tr}(A_1),\ldots,\mathrm{Tr}(B_n))\\
&\quad + \sum_{\substack{\pi\in P(m+n)\\ \pi\vee\tau=1_{m+n}}} k_\pi(\mathrm{Tr}(A_1),\ldots,\mathrm{Tr}(B_n))\\
&= \mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}(A_1)\cdots\mathrm{Tr}(A_m))\,\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}(B_1)\cdots\mathrm{Tr}(B_n))\\
&\quad + \sum_{\substack{\pi\in P(m+n)\\ \pi\vee\tau=1_{m+n}}} k_\pi(\mathrm{Tr}(A_1),\ldots,\mathrm{Tr}(B_n)).
\end{aligned}$$

All cumulants of order higher than 1 are bounded; moreover, for all indices $l$, we have that $k_1(\mathrm{Tr}(B_l)) = 0$, since the $B_l$'s are assumed to be centered. Let $s$ be the number if singletons of $\pi|_{[m]}$. Then $s\le m$ and so

$$k_\pi(\mathrm{Tr}(A_1),\ldots,\mathrm{Tr}(B_n)) = O(N^s).$$

But $s = m$ only when $\pi|_{[m]} = 0_m = \{(1), \ldots, (m)\}$, which cannot happen when $\pi \vee \tau = 1_{m+n}$. Thus

$$\sum_{\substack{\pi \in P(m+n) \\ \pi \vee \tau = 1_{m+n}}} k_\pi(\mathrm{Tr}(A_1), \ldots, \mathrm{Tr}(B_n)) = O(N^{m-1}).$$

This proves $(ii)$. □

*Remark* 6. Suppose that $\sigma \in S_m$ has the cycle decomposition $\sigma = c_1 \cdot c_2 \cdots c_r$ with each $c_k = (i_{k,1}, i_{k,2}, \ldots, i_{k,s(k)})$. For $A_j$'s and $B_l$'s as in Proposition 5, denote

$$\mathrm{Tr}_\sigma(A_1, \ldots, A_m) = \prod_{k=1}^{r} \mathrm{Tr}(A_{i_{k,1}} \cdots A_{i_{k,s(k)}}).$$

With this notation, Proposition 5 implies that

$$\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}_\sigma(A_1 A_2 \cdots A_m)) = O(N^r),$$

respectively

$$\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}_\sigma(A_1 A_2 \cdots A_m)\,\mathrm{Tr}(B_1) \cdots \mathrm{Tr}(B_n)) \\ = \mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}_\sigma(A_1 A_2 \cdots A_m)) \cdot \mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}(B_1) \cdots \mathrm{Tr}(B_n)).$$

2.3. **Combinatorial results.** For $n$ a positive integer, let, as in Section 2.1, $[n] = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$: denote $[-n] = \{-n, -n+1, \ldots, -1\}$ and $[\pm n] = [-n] \cup [n]$. As in [MP], we will regard a permutation $\sigma$ on $[n]$ also as a permutation on $[\pm n]$ where for $1 \leq k \leq n$ we let $\sigma(-k) = -k$.

The sets of permutations on $[n]$, respectively $[\pm n]$ such that each one of their cycles has exactly 2 elements will be denoted by $P_2(n)$, respectively $P_2(\pm n)$ ( if $n$ is odd, then by convention $P_2(n) = \emptyset$). It was shown in [MP] that if $p, q \in P_2(\pm n)$, then $pq$ has a cycle decomposition $c_1 c_1' \ldots c_l, c_l'$ with the property that for all $k$, if $c_k = (i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_l)$, then $c_k' = (q(i_l), q(i_{l-1}), \ldots, q(i_1))$.

We will denote by $\delta$ the element of $P_2(\pm n)$ given by $\delta(k) = -k$. If $\sigma$ is a permutation on some finite set, the number of cycles of $\sigma$ will be denoted by $\#(\sigma)$.

For a multi-index $\boldsymbol{i} \in [N]^{[\pm n]}$, and $p \in P_2(\pm n)$ we write $\boldsymbol{i} = \boldsymbol{i} \circ p$ to mean that for every $(r, s) \in p$ we have $i(r) = i(s)$. Consider now $A = (a_{ij})_{i,j=1}^N$ to be a $N \times N$ random matrix; we will use the notation from Section 2.1, namely $A^{(1)} = A$ and $A^{(-1)} = A^t$. For $\epsilon = (\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \ldots, \epsilon_n) \in \{-1, 1\}^n$ and $\pi \in S_n$, let $\mathrm{Tr}_{(\pi,\epsilon)}(A_1, \ldots, A_n) = \mathrm{Tr}_\pi(A_1^{(\epsilon_1)}, \ldots, A_n^{(\epsilon_n)})$

We saw that the cycle decomposition of $p\delta$ may be written $c_1 c_1{}' \cdots c_s c_s{}'$ where $c_i{}' = \delta c_i^{-1} \delta$. Since $c'' = c$, it is arbitrary which of the pair $\{c_i, c_i{}'\}$ is called $c_i$ and which $c_i{}'$.

For each $i$, choose a representative of each pair $\{c_i, c_i'\}$, say $c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_s$. We shall construct a permutation $\pi(p) \in S_n$ and $\epsilon \in \{-1, 1\}^n$ which will depend on our choice of $\{c_1, \ldots, c_s\}$. For each $i$ we construct a cycle $\tilde{c}_i$ as follows. Suppose $c_i = (l_1, \ldots, l_r)$. Let $\tilde{c}_i = (j_1, j_2, \ldots, j_r)$ where $j_k = |l_k|$ and $\epsilon_{j_k} = l_k/|l_k|$. Define $\pi(p) = \tilde{c}_1 \cdots \tilde{c}_s$ and $\epsilon = (\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_n)$.

The following result was proved in [MP], Lemma 5.

**Lemma 7.** *With the notations above, we have that*

$$\sum_{\substack{1_{\pm 1}, \ldots, i_{\pm n} = 1 \\ i = i \circ p}}^{N} a^{(1)}_{i_1 i_{-1}} a^{(2)}_{i_2 i_{-2}} \cdot \cdots \cdot a^{(n)}_{i_n i_{-n}} = \mathrm{Tr}_{\pi(p)}(A_1^{(\epsilon_1)}, \ldots, A_n^{(\epsilon_n)}).$$

*Remark* 8. In the framework above, if $p([n]) = [-n]$, then $p\delta([n]) = [n]$, so the cycles of $p\delta$ have either only positive or only negative elements, therefore $\epsilon_j = 1$ for all $j = 1, 2, \ldots, n$.

2.4. **Results on asymptotic second order freeness.** In this section we will recall some results from [MP] and [CS].

**Theorem 9.** *Let $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_s\}_{N \geq 1}$ and $\mathcal{B} = \{B_1, B_2, \ldots, B_p\}_{N \geq 1}$ be two ensembles of $N \times N$ random matrices such that the entries of $\mathcal{A}$ and the entries of $\mathcal{B}$ form two independent families of random variables. Let $\mathcal{O} = \{O\}_{N \geq 1}$ be a family of $N \times N$ Haar distributed orthogonal random matrices with entries independent from the entries of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$.*

*(i) If the ensemble $\mathcal{A}$ has the t-bounded cumulants property, then $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{O}$ satisfy equation (4) (as in Remark 4) and the ensemble $\mathcal{O} \cup \mathcal{A}$ has the t-bounded cumulants property. If $\mathcal{A}$ has a second order limit t-distribution, then $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{O}$ asymptotically real second order free.*

*(ii) If the ensembles $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ both have the t-bounded cumulants property, then the ensembles $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}} = \{OAO^t : A \in \mathcal{A}\}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ satisfy equation (4), and $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}} \cup \mathcal{B}$ has the t -bounded cumulants property. If $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ have second order limit t-distributions, then $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are asymptotically real second order free.*

*Proof.* We begin with the proof of $(i)$. In Remark 39 of [MP] we gave two conditions sufficient for the validity of equation (4). These were the conditions that $\mathcal{A}$ have the $t$ -bounded cumulants property. If $\mathcal{A}$ has a second order limit $t$-distribution, then the claim that $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{O}$ are asymptotically free was proved in Theorem 50 of [MP].

Next we prove $(ii)$. We must show that $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}} \cup \mathcal{B}$ has the bounded cumulants property. Let us recall the formula

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}_\gamma(O^{\epsilon_1}Y_1, \ldots, O^{\epsilon_n}Y_n)) \\ &\quad = \sum_{p,q \in \mathcal{P}_2(n)} \langle \mathrm{Wg}(p), q \rangle \, \mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}_{\pi_{p \cdot \epsilon q}, \eta_{p \cdot \epsilon q}}(Y_1, \ldots, Y_n) \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

from [MP, Proposition 12]. Note that here Wg denotes the orthogonal Weingarten function. When $\epsilon$ has the special form $\epsilon_k = (-1)^{k+1}$ we have by [MP, Proposition 13] that $\pi_{p \cdot \epsilon q}$ is parity preserving, i.e. all cycles consist of numbers with the same parity. This means that on the right hand side of (5) only words in elements all from $\mathcal{A}$ or all from $\mathcal{B}$ appear. Thus as far as the asymptotics of (5) are concerned we may assume that $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B}$ has the $t$-bounded cumulants property. By $(i)$ we then have that $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}} \cup \mathcal{B}$ satisfies equation (4). Finally if $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ have second order limit distributions then as they satisfy equation (4) there are asymptotically real second order free. □

We will need to make use of the unitary Weingarten function Wg. For positive integers $N$ and $n$ we have a function $\mathrm{Wg}_N : S_n \to \mathbb{C}$ which can be used to evaluate integrals with respect to Haar measure, $d\mathcal{U}$, on the group $\mathcal{U}(N)$ of $N \times N$ unitary matrices. We will use the notation $u_{i,j}$ for the function $u_{i,j} : \mathcal{U}(N) \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ that gives the value of the $(i,j)$-entry. We also need to use the Möbius function $\mu$ of the partially ordered set of non-crossing partitions and apply it to a permutation. Recall that $\mu : NC(n) \times NC(n) \to \mathbb{R}$ is multiplicative and satisfies $\mu(0_n, 1_n) = (-1)^{n-1} C_{n-1}$ where $C_n = \binom{2n}{n}/(n+1)$ is the $n^{th}$ Catalan number (see [NS, Thm. 10.15]). Let $\sigma \in S_n$ be a permutation with cycle decomposition $c_1 c_2 \cdots c_k$. If we consider $\sigma$ to be a partition whose blocks are the cycles $c_1, \ldots, c_k$ then we set $\mathrm{Möb}(\sigma) = \mu(0_n, \sigma)$. Corollaries 2.4 and 2.7 from [CS] can be formulated as follows.

**Theorem 10.** *For all positive integers $n, m$ and all multi-indices $\boldsymbol{i}, \boldsymbol{i}' \in [N]^{[n]}$, respectively $\boldsymbol{j}, \boldsymbol{j}' \in [N]^{[m]}$ we have that*

$$\int_{\mathcal{U}(N)} u_{i_1,j_1} \cdots u_{i_n,j_n} \overline{u_{i'_1,j'_1}} \cdots \overline{u_{i'_n,j'_n}} \, d\mathcal{U} = \delta_{m,n} \cdot \sum_{\sigma,\tau \in S_n} \delta^{\boldsymbol{i}}_{\boldsymbol{i}' \circ \sigma} \delta^{\boldsymbol{j}}_{\boldsymbol{j}' \circ \tau} \cdot \mathrm{Wg}_N(\tau \sigma^{-1}).$$

*Moreover*

$$\mathrm{Wg}_N(\sigma) = N^{-2n+\#(\sigma)} \, \mathrm{Möb}(\sigma) + O(N^{-2n+\#(\sigma)-2}).$$




FIGURE 4. On the left we have a permutation $\sigma \in S_6$ with cycle decomposition $(1,2,3)(4,6)(5)$. On the right we have the corresponding pairing $\hat{\sigma} \in \mathcal{P}_2(12)$ with pairs $(1,11)$ $(2,10)(3,12)(4,7)(5,8)(6,9)$. Under $\hat{\sigma}$ each number in $[6]$ is paired with a number in $[7,12]$.

## 3. Haar Distributed Random Unitary Matrices

We will use a slight reformulation of Theorem 10 in the spirit of [MP]. First we define the map $S_n \ni \sigma \mapsto \hat{\sigma} \in \mathcal{P}_2(2n)$ given by $\hat{\sigma}(i) = 2n+1-\sigma(i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Note that $\hat{\sigma}(2n+1-i) = \sigma^{-1}(i)$ and that $\sigma \mapsto \hat{\sigma}$ is a bijection from $S_n$ to the set $\{\pi \in \mathcal{P}_2(2n) : \pi([n]) = [2n]\backslash[n]\}$. See Fig. 4.

**Lemma 11.** *Let $\sigma, \tau$ be permutations from $S_n$ and $c_1 c_2 \cdots c_p$ be the cycle decomposition of $\tau\sigma^{-1}$. Then $\hat{\tau}\hat{\sigma}$ has the cycle decomposition $d_1 d_1' d_2 d_2' \cdots d_p d_p'$ where, if $c_k = (i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_l)$ then $d_k = (2n+1-i_1, 2n+1-i_2, \ldots, 2n+1-i_l)$ and $d_k' = (\sigma^{-1}(i_l), \sigma^{-1}(i_{l-1}), \ldots, \sigma^{-1}(i_1))$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose $(i_1, \ldots, i_l)$ is a cycle of $\tau\sigma^{-1}$ and denote $j_k = \sigma^{-1}(i_k)$, $1 \leq k \leq l$. To simplify the writing, we will consider that $i_{l+1} = i_1$ and $j_{l+1} = j_1$. Then $\hat{\tau}\hat{\sigma}(2n+1-i_k) = \hat{\tau}(\sigma^{-1}(i_k)) = \hat{\tau}(j_k) = 2n+1-i_{k+1}$, while

$$\hat{\tau}\hat{\sigma}(\sigma^{-1}(i_k)) = \hat{\tau}\hat{\sigma}\hat{\sigma}(2n+1-i_k) = \hat{\tau}(2n+1-i_k) = j_{k-1} = \sigma^{-1}(i_{k-1}).$$

□

We introduce now the map $\Phi_N : \mathcal{P}_2(n) \times \mathcal{P}_2(n) \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ as follows. Let $p, q \in \mathcal{P}_2(n)$ be pairings and write the cycle decomposition of $pq$ as $c_1 c_1' \cdots c_l c_l'$ with $c_k' = q c_k^{-1} q$. Let $m = n/2$, the cycles $c_1 \cdots c_l$ form a permutation of subset of $[n]$ with $m$ elements. Choose $\sigma \in S_m$ so that $\sigma$ has the same cycle structure as $c_1 \cdots c_l$. By this we mean that $\sigma$ has $l$ cycles and the lengths of the cycles of $\sigma$ match those of $c_1 \cdots c_l$. Let $\Phi_N(p,q) = \mathrm{Wg}_N(\sigma)$. As shown in [CS], the value $\mathrm{Wg}_N(\sigma)$ depends

only on the cycle decomposition of $\sigma$, so $\Phi_N$ is well-defined. Note that Theorem 10 then gives that

$$\Phi_N(p,q) = N^{-n+\#(pq)/2} \cdot \text{Möb}(\sigma) + O(N^{-n+\#(pq)/2-2}). \tag{6}$$

With the above notation, Theorem 10 can be reformulated using pairings. Let $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \in \{-1, 1\}$. We shall, as usual, regard $\alpha$ as the $n$-tuple $(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n)$ and the function $\alpha : [n] \to \{-1, 1\}$. Let

$$\mathcal{P}_2^\alpha(n) = \{p \in \mathcal{P}_2(n) \mid \text{ if } p(k) = l \text{ then } \alpha_k = -\alpha_l\}.$$

In the language of functions we can write the property as $\alpha \circ p = -\alpha$. Theorem 10 has the following reformulation which extends the version stated in [CM]. For the reader's convenience we provide a proof. Here we are following our convention that $u_{ij}^{(1)} = u_{ij}$ and $u_{ij}^{(-1)} = \overline{u_{ij}}$. Recall our convention regarding permutations from 2.3, namely that if a $\pi$ is a permutation of $[n]$, we extend $\pi$ to be a permutation of $[\pm n]$ by setting $\pi(-k) = -k$ form $k > 0$.

**Proposition 12.** *Then*

$$\int_{\mathcal{U}(N)} u_{i_1,i_{-1}}^{(\alpha_1)} \cdots u_{i_n,i_{-n}}^{(\alpha_n)} d\mathcal{U} = \sum_{p,q \in P_2^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(n)} \delta_{\boldsymbol{i} \circ p \delta q \delta} \cdot \Phi_N(p,q). \tag{7}$$

*Proof.* If the cardinalities of $\alpha^{-1}(1)$ and $\alpha^{-1}(-1)$ are different that both sides of (7) are 0. That the left hand side is 0 follows from Theorem 10 and that the right hand side is 0 is because in this case $\mathcal{P}_2^\alpha(n)$ is empty. So we shall assume that $n = 2m$ and both of $\alpha^{-1}(1)$ and $\alpha^{-1}(-1)$ have cardinality $m$.

Let $A = \alpha^{-1}(-1) \cap [m]$ and $B = \alpha^{-1}(1) \cap [m+1, n]$. Then $A$ and $B$ must have the same cardinality, $k$. Write $A = \{s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_k\}$ and $B = \{s_{-1}, s_{-2}, \ldots, s_{-k}\}$. Define $\pi \in S_{2m}$ as follows

$$\pi(k) = \begin{cases} k & \text{if } k \in [2m] \setminus (A \cup B) \\ s_{-p} & \text{if } k = s_p \in A \cup B. \end{cases}$$

Let $\widetilde{\alpha} = \alpha \circ \pi$, then

$$\widetilde{\alpha}_k = \alpha \circ \pi(k) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } k \leq m \\ -1 & \text{if } k > m. \end{cases}$$

Note that $\pi$ is an involution and for $p \in P_2^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(2m)$, we have $\tilde{p} := \pi \circ p \circ \pi \in \mathcal{P}_2^{\widetilde{\alpha}}(2m)$. Moreover since $\tilde{p}\tilde{q} = \pi p q \pi$, $\tilde{p}\tilde{q}$ and $pq$ have the same cycle structure and so $\Phi_N(p,q) = \Phi_N(\widetilde{p}, \widetilde{q})$. Also $i = i \circ p$ is equivalent to $i \circ \pi = (i \circ \pi) \circ \tilde{p}$. Therefore, without loss of generality, we can suppose that $\alpha_1 = \cdots = \alpha_m = 1$ and $\alpha_{m+1} = \cdots = \alpha_{2m} = -1$. With this assumption, the map $\sigma \mapsto \widehat{\sigma}$ is a bijection from $S_m$ to $\mathcal{P}_2^\alpha(2m)$.

For $1 \leq k \leq m$ let $i'_k = i_{2m+1-k}$, $j_k = i_{-k}$ and $j'_k = i_{-(2m+1-k)}$. Then

$$\int_{\mathcal{U}(N)} u^{(\alpha_1)}_{i_1 i_{-1}} \cdots u^{(\alpha_n)}_{i_n i_{-n}} \, d\mathcal{U} = \int_{\mathcal{U}(N)} u_{i_1 j_1} \cdots u_{i_m j_m} \overline{u_{i'_1 j'_1}} \cdots \overline{u_{i'_m j'_m}} \, d\mathcal{U}.$$

Also the equality $i = i' \circ \sigma$ means that for $k > 0$, $i(k) = i(\hat{\sigma}(k))$. Likewise the equality $j = j' \circ \tau$ means that for $k > 0$, $i(-k) = j(k) = i(-\hat{\tau}(k))$. Together they are equivalent to $i = i \circ \hat{\sigma}\delta\hat{\tau}\delta$. Theorem 10 gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathcal{U}(N)} u^{(\alpha_1)}_{i_1, i_{-1}} \cdots u^{\alpha_n}_{i_n, i_{-n}} d\mathcal{U} \\
&= \sum_{\sigma, \tau \in S_m} \delta^i_{i' \circ \sigma} \delta^j_{j' \circ \tau} \operatorname{Wg}_N(\tau \sigma^{-1}) \\
&= \sum_{\sigma, \tau \in S_m} \delta^i_{i \circ \hat{\sigma}\delta\hat{\tau}\delta} \Phi_N(\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\tau}) = \sum_{p, q \in P_2^{\alpha}(2m)} \delta^{\boldsymbol{i}}_{\boldsymbol{i} \circ p \delta q \delta} \cdot \Phi_N(p, q).
\end{aligned}$$

□

For the rest of this section, $U_N$ will denote a $N \times N$ Haar distributed unitary random matrix, and $\mathfrak{U}$ will denote the ensemble $\{U_N, U_N^t, U_N^*, \overline{U_N}\}_N$, i.e., with the notations from Section 2.1, $\mathfrak{U} = \{U_N^{(\epsilon,\eta)} : (\epsilon, \eta) \in \{-1, 1\}^2\}$. Here for a matrix $A = (a_{ij})_{ij}$, $\overline{A} = (A^*)^t = (\overline{a_{ij}})$ denotes the matrix obtained by taking the complex conjugate of each entry. As before, we will omit the index $N$ under the assumption that we will only multiply matrices of the same size.

**Definition 13.** An ensemble $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, \ldots, A_s\}$ of random matrices is said to be *unitarily invariant* if for any positive integer $N$, any $N \times N$ unitary matrix $U$, any $r_1, \ldots, r_k$, and any $i_1, \ldots, i_n, i_{-1}, \ldots, i_{-n}$, we have that

$$\mathrm{E}(a^{(r_1)}_{i_1, i_{-1}} a^{(r_2)}_{i_2, i_{-2}} \cdots a^{(r_k)}_{i_s, i_{-s}}) = \mathrm{E}(b^{(r_1)}_{i_1, i_{-1}} b^{(r_2)}_{i_2, i_{-2}} \cdots b^{(r_k)}_{i_s, i_{-s}})$$

where $a^{(k)}_{ij}$ is the $(i, j)$-entry of $A_k$ and $b^{(k)}_{ij}$ is the $(i, j)$-entry of $UA_kU^{-1}$.

If this holds for $U$ replaced by any orthogonal matrix we say the ensemble $\mathcal{A}$ is *orthogonally invariant*.

Note that by the invariance of Haar measure for any unitary matrix $V$ and any Haar distributed random unitary matrix $U$, we have that $VUV^{-1}$ is another Haar distributed random unitary matrix. Since any orthogonal matrix is a unitary matrix we get the same conclusion if we replace $V$ by an orthogonal matrix. Now consider $U$ and $U^*$ together. Let $A_1 = U$, $A_2 = U^*$, $B_1 = VA_1V^{-1}$, and $B_2 = VA_2V^{-1}$. Then by the unitary invariance of the ensemble $\{U, U^*\}$ we have $\mathrm{E}(a^{(1)}_{11} a^{(2)}_{22}) =$

$\mathrm{E}(b_{11}^{(1)}b_{22}^{(2)})$ for any unitary $V$. In the lemma below we shall show that when we set $A_2 = \overline{U}$ and for a particular $V$, we have $\mathrm{E}(a_{11}^{(1)}a_{22}^{(2)}) \neq \mathrm{E}(b_{11}^{(1)}b_{22}^{(2)})$, thus demonstrating that the ensemble $\{U, \overline{U}\}$ is not unitarily invariant.

*Notation* 14. Let $\{U_N\}_N$ be an ensemble of Haar unitary random matrices, we shall denote by $\mathfrak{U}$ the ensemble $\{U_N, U_N^t, U_N^*, \overline{U}\}_N$.

**Lemma 15.** *The ensemble $\mathfrak{U}$ is orthogonally invariant, but not unitarily invariant.*

*Proof.* That $\mathfrak{U}$ is orthogonally invariant follows from the remark above and the identity

$$(OUO^t)^{(\varepsilon,\eta)} = OU^{(\varepsilon,\eta)}O^t$$

for all $(\varepsilon, \eta) \in \{-1, 1\}^2$ and $O$ an orthogonal matrix.

Indeed, let us denote by $E_{i,j}$ the $N \times N$ matrix with all entries 0 except for the $(i, j)$-entry which is 1. Also, for $A$ a random matrix, denote $(A)_{i,j}$ its $(i, j)$ entry.

For a positive integer $r$, a multi-index $\boldsymbol{i} \in [N]^{[\pm s]}$ and $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \boldsymbol{\eta} \in \{-1, 1\}^s$, define the function $f_{\boldsymbol{i},\boldsymbol{\varepsilon},\boldsymbol{\eta}} : \mathcal{U}(N) \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ given by

$$f_{\boldsymbol{i},\boldsymbol{\varepsilon},\boldsymbol{\eta}}(U) = \prod_{k=1}^{s}(U^{(\varepsilon_k,\eta_k)})_{i_k i_{-k}} = \mathrm{Tr}(\prod_{k=1}^{s} E_{1i_k}U^{(\varepsilon_k,\eta_k)}E_{i_{-k}1}).$$

According to Theorem 10, $f_{\boldsymbol{i},\boldsymbol{\varepsilon},\boldsymbol{\eta}} \in L^\infty(\mathcal{U}(N), d\mathcal{U})$ for all $\boldsymbol{i}, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \boldsymbol{\eta}$ as above, and the translation invariance of Haar measure gives that

$$\int_{\mathcal{U}(N)} f_{\boldsymbol{i},\boldsymbol{\varepsilon},\boldsymbol{\eta}}(U)d\mathcal{U} = \int_{\mathcal{U}(N)} f_{\boldsymbol{i},\boldsymbol{\varepsilon},\boldsymbol{\eta}}(OUO^t)d\mathcal{U}.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{E}\Big(\prod_{k=1}^{s}(U^{(\varepsilon_k,\eta_k)})_{i_k i_{-k}}\Big) &= \int_{\mathcal{U}(N)} f_{\boldsymbol{i},\boldsymbol{\varepsilon},\boldsymbol{\eta}}(U)d\mathcal{U} = \int_{\mathcal{U}(N)} f_{\boldsymbol{i},\boldsymbol{\varepsilon},\boldsymbol{\eta}}(OUO^t)d\mathcal{U} \\
&= \mathrm{E}\Big(\mathrm{Tr}\Big(\prod_{k=1}^{s} E_{1i_k}(OUO^t)^{(\varepsilon_k,\eta_k)}E_{i_{-k}1}\Big)\Big) \\
&= \mathrm{E}\left(\mathrm{Tr}\Big(\prod_{k=1}^{s} \mathrm{E}_{1i_k}(OU^{(\varepsilon_k,\eta_k)}O^t)\,\mathrm{E}_{i_{-k}1}\Big)\right) \\
&= \mathrm{E}\Big(\prod_{k=1}^{s}(OU^{(\varepsilon_k,\eta_k)}O^t)_{i_k i_{-k}}\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

For the second part, let $V$ be the $N \times N$ unitary matrix

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} \sin\theta & i\cos\theta & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ i\cos\theta & \sin\theta & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

where $\theta$ is such that $\cos\theta \sin\theta \neq 0$. Let $A_1 = U$ and $A_2 = \overline{U}$ and let $B_1 = VA_1V^*$ and $B_2 = VA_2V^*$. Then $a_{11}^{(1)} = u_{11}$ and $a_{22}^{(2)} = \overline{u_{22}}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} b_{11}^{(1)} &= \sin^2\theta u_{11} + i\cos\theta\sin\theta u_{21} - i\cos\theta\sin\theta u_{12} + \cos^2\theta u_{22} \\ b_{22}^{(2)} &= \cos^2\theta\overline{u_{11}} - i\cos\theta\sin\theta\overline{u_{21}} + i\cos\theta\sin\theta\overline{u_{12}} + \sin^2\theta\overline{u_{22}}. \end{aligned}$$

Recall from Proposition 12 that $\mathrm{E}(u_{ij}u_{kl}) = 0$ for all $i, j, k, l$ and $\mathrm{E}(u_{ij}\overline{u_{kl}}) \neq 0$ only when $i = k$ and $j = l$, in which case $\mathrm{E}(u_{ij}\overline{u_{ij}}) = N^{-1}$. So $\mathrm{E}(a_{11}^{(1)}a_{22}^{(2)}) = 0$. On the other hand in $\mathrm{E}(b_{11}^{(1)}b_{22}^{(2)})$ there are sixteen terms of which only four are non-zero. So

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{E}(b_{11}^{(1)}b_{22}^{(2)}) &= \cos^2\theta\sin^2\theta\,\mathrm{E}(u_{11}\overline{u_{11}} + u_{21}\overline{u_{21}} + u_{12}\overline{u_{12}} + u_{22}\overline{u_{22}}) \\ &= 4\cos^2\theta\sin^2\theta N^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\mathrm{E}(a_{11}^{(1)}a_{22}^{(2)}) \neq \mathrm{E}(b_{11}^{(1)}b_{22}^{(2)})$. □

**Definition 16.** Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a set of $N \times N$ random matrices. A word $W$ in elements from $\mathcal{A}$ and $N \times N$ unitary matrices from $\mathfrak{U}$ will be called *simplified* if either $W$ is a centered polynomial in matrices from $\mathcal{A}$ with complex coefficients, or

$$W = A_1U^{(\epsilon_1,\eta_1)}A_2U^{(\epsilon_2,\eta_2)}\cdots A_mU^{(\epsilon_m,\eta_m)}$$

with each $\epsilon_i, \eta_i \in \{-1, 1\}$ and each $A_i$ either a centered polynomial in matrices from $\mathcal{A}$ with complex coefficients, or the identity matrix, but $A_i$ can be the identity matrix only if $(\epsilon_{i-1}, \eta_{i-1}) \neq (-\epsilon_i, -\eta_i)$, for $i > 1$, respectively only if $(\epsilon_1, \eta_1) \neq (-\epsilon_m, -\eta_m)$, for $i = 1$.

**Lemma 17.** *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a set of $N \times N$ random matrices and $W$ be a polynomial with complex coefficients in elements from $\mathcal{A}$ and $N \times N$ unitaries from $\mathfrak{U}$. Then there exist $W_1, \ldots, W_m$ some simplified words in $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathfrak{U}$ and $c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_m$ some polynomials with complex coefficients in expectations of normalized traces of products of elements from $\mathcal{A}$ such that*

$$\mathrm{Tr}(W) = c_0 + c_1\,\mathrm{Tr}(W_1) + \cdots + c_n\,\mathrm{Tr}(W_m).$$

*Proof.* If $W$ does not contain elements from $\mathfrak{U}$, the result is trivial, since $W = \mathring{W} + \mathrm{E}(\mathrm{tr}(W))$, where, for a random matrix $A$, we take $\mathring{A} = A - \mathrm{E}(\mathrm{tr}(A))$. If $W$ contains both elements from $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathfrak{U}$, due to linearity and traciality, we may suppose that

$$W = A_1 U^{(\epsilon_1,\eta_1)} A_2 U^{(\epsilon_2,\eta_2)} \cdots A_m U^{(\epsilon_m,\eta_m)}$$

with each $\epsilon_i, \eta_i \in \{-1, 1\}$ and each $A_i$ a polynomial in matrices from $\mathcal{A}$ with complex coefficients.

For $W$ as above, let $n$ the number of $A_i$ not as in Definition 16. We will show the result by induction on $(m, n)$. If $m = n = 1$, the result is trivial, since

$$\mathrm{Tr}(A_1 U^{(\epsilon_1,\eta_1)}) = \mathrm{Tr}(\mathring{A}_1 U^{(\epsilon_1,\eta_1)}).$$

For the inductive step, using again traciality, let us suppose that $A_m$ does not satisfy the conditions from Definition 16. Then

$$\begin{aligned} W = {} & A_1 U^{(\epsilon_1,\eta_1)} A_2 U^{(\epsilon_2,\eta_2)} \cdots A_{m-1} U^{(\epsilon_{m-1},\eta_{m-1})} \mathring{A}_m U^{(\epsilon_m,\eta_m)} \\ & + \mathrm{E}(\mathrm{tr}(A_m)) A_1 U^{(\epsilon_1,\eta_1)} A_2 U^{(\epsilon_2,\eta_2)} \cdots A_{m-1} U^{(\epsilon_{m-1},\eta_{m-1})} U^{(\epsilon_m,\eta_m)}. \end{aligned}$$

The number of $A_i$'s from the first term of the right-hand side not satisfying the conditions from Definition 16 is strictly less than $n$. For the second term, we distinguish two cases. If $(\epsilon_{m-1}, \eta_{m-1}) = (-\epsilon_m, -\eta_m)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{Tr}(A_1 U^{(\epsilon_1,\eta_1)} A_2 U^{(\epsilon_2,\eta_2)} \cdots A_{m-1} U^{(\epsilon_{m-1},\eta_{m-1})} U^{(\epsilon_m,\eta_m)}) \\ & \qquad = \mathrm{Tr}(A_{m-1} A_1 U^{(\epsilon_1,\eta_1)} \cdots A_{m-2} U^{(\epsilon_{m-2},\eta_{m-2})}) \end{aligned}$$

and the word from the right-hand side has length strictly less than $2m$. If $(\epsilon_{m-1}, \eta_{m-1}) \neq (-\epsilon_m, -\eta_m)$ then

$$\begin{aligned} & A_1 U^{(\epsilon_1,\eta_1)} A_2 U^{(\epsilon_2,\eta_2)} \cdots A_{m-1} U^{(\epsilon_{m-1},\eta_{m-1})} U^{(\epsilon_m,\eta_m)} \\ & \qquad = A_1 U^{(\epsilon_1,\eta_1)} A_2 U^{(\epsilon_2,\eta_2)} \cdots A_{m-1} U^{(\epsilon_{m-1},\eta_{m-1})} I U^{(\epsilon_m,\eta_m)} \end{aligned}$$

and the number of $A'i$'s not satisfying the conditions from Definition 16 in word from the right-hand side is $n - 1$. □

**Theorem 18.** *If $\mathcal{A}$ is an ensemble of random matrices which is independent from $\mathfrak{U}$ and has the t-bounded cumulants property, then the ensemble $\mathfrak{U} \cup \mathcal{A}$ also has the t-bounded cumulants property.*

*Proof.* Following Definition 1, we must show that for $R \geq 2$ and any polynomials with complex coefficients $W_1, \ldots, W_R$ in elements from $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}^t$ and $\mathfrak{U}$, we have that

- $\sup_N |\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{tr}(W_i))| < \infty$ for each $i$ and
- $\sup_N |k_R(\mathrm{Tr}(W_1), \ldots, \mathrm{Tr}(W_R))| < \infty$.

From Lemma 17, we have that

$$\operatorname{Tr}(W_i) = c_{i,0} + c_{i,1}\operatorname{Tr}(W_{i,1}) + \cdots + c_{i,m(i)}\operatorname{Tr}(W_{i,m(i)})$$

where $c_{i,k}$'s are polynomials in normalized traces of products of elements from $\mathcal{A}$ and $W_{i,k}$'s are simplified words in $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}^t$ and $\mathfrak{U}$. Since $\mathcal{A}$ has the $t$-bounded cumulants property, each $c_{i,k}$ is bounded as $N \longrightarrow \infty$, therefore, using the multilinearity of the cumulants, it suffices to show the result for $W_i$ simplified words in $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}^t$ and $\mathfrak{U}$. Therefore, we may suppose that

$$\begin{aligned} W_i &= U^{(\epsilon_{M_{i-1}+1},\eta_{M_{i-1}+1})} B_{M_{i-1}+1} \cdots U^{(\epsilon_{M_i},\eta_{M_i})} B_{M_i}, \text{ for } 1 \le i \le r \\ W_{r+k} &= B_{M+k}, \text{ for } 1 \le k \le R-r, \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where $M_0, M_1, \ldots, M_r$ is a strictly increasing sequence of positive integers with $M_0 = 0$, $M_r = M$, $R$ is a positive integer greater than $r$, $(\epsilon_i, \eta_i) \in \{-1, 1\}^2$ and $B_k$ are centered polynomials in elements from $\mathcal{A}$ or identity matrices, such that

- for $1 \le i \le r$, if $(\epsilon_{M_{i-1}+1}, \eta_{M_{i-1}+i}) = (-\epsilon_{M_i}, -\eta_{M_i})$, then $B_{M_i} \neq I$
- for $1 \le i \le r$ and $0 \le k \le M_{i+1} - M_i - 1$, if $(\epsilon_{M_i+k}, \eta_{M_i+k}) = (-\epsilon_{M_i+k+1}, -\eta_{M_i+k+1})$ then $B_{M_i+k} \neq I$
- $B_{M+k} \neq I$, for $1 \le k \le R-r$

We claim that it suffices to show that for $W_1, \ldots, W_R$ as above we have

$$\operatorname{E}(\operatorname{Tr}(W_1) \cdots \operatorname{Tr}(W_R)) = O(1). \tag{9}$$

Indeed, first note that $(i)$ is automatic because $\operatorname{tr} = N^{-1}\operatorname{Tr}$. For $(ii)$ let us recall some notation from [NS].

Let $X_1, \ldots, X_R$ be random variables and $\pi = \{V_1, \ldots, V_k\} \in \mathcal{P}(R)$ be a partition of $[R]$. We let

$$\operatorname{E}_\pi(X_1, \ldots, X_R) = \prod_{V \in \pi} \operatorname{E}\big(\prod_{j \in V} X_j\big).$$

For example, when $\pi = \{(1,3,5)(2,4)\}$,

$$\operatorname{E}_\pi(X_1, \ldots, X_5) = \operatorname{E}(X_1 X_3 X_5)\operatorname{E}(X_2 X_4).$$

With this notation we can write the inverse of equation (1) via the Möbius function, $\mu$, for the poset $\mathcal{P}(R)$, see [NS, Prop. 10.11 and Ex. 10.33]. Namely

$$k_R(X_1, \ldots, X_R) = \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}(R)} \mu(\pi, 1_R)\operatorname{E}_\pi(X_1, \ldots, X_R). \tag{10}$$

If (9) holds then for all $\pi$ we have that

$$\mathrm{E}_\pi(\mathrm{Tr}(W_1)\cdots\mathrm{Tr}(W_R)) = O(1).$$

Hence by equation (10) we get $(ii)$.

Thus we must show that for every $\{l_i\}_i, R, \{(\epsilon_i,\eta_i)\}_i$, $\{b_i\}_i$ satisfying $(a)$, $(b)$, and $(c)$ we have equation (9).

Let $(\epsilon_1,\eta_1),\ldots,(\epsilon_r,\eta_r)\in\{-1,1\}^2$. Denote the $(i,j)$-entry of $B_k$ by $b_{i,j}^{(k)}$. Let us find an expansion for

$$\mathrm{Tr}(U^{(\epsilon_1,\eta_1)}B_1\cdots U^{(\epsilon_k,\eta_k)}B_k).$$

We shall let $\gamma=(1,2,3,\ldots,k)$ be the permutation of $[k]$ which has just one cycle. We have that

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{Tr}(U^{(\epsilon_1,\eta_1)}B_1\cdots U^{(\epsilon_k,\eta_k)}B_k)\\ &\quad=\sum_{\substack{i_1,\ldots,i_k\\ i_{-1},\ldots,i_{-k}}}\left(U^{(\epsilon_1,\eta_1)}\right)_{i_1i_{-1}}(B_1)_{i_{-1}i_2}\cdots\left(U^{(\epsilon_k,\eta_k)}\right)_{i_ki_{-k}}(B_k)_{i_{-k}i_1}.\end{aligned}$$

Now $\left(U^{(\epsilon_l,\eta_l)}\right)_{i_li_{-l}}=u^{(\eta_l)}_{j_lj_{-l}}$ where $j_l=i_{\epsilon_l l}$. Also $(B_l)_{i_{-l}i_{\gamma(l)}}=b^{(l)}_{j_{\varphi(l)},j_{\varphi(-l)}}$ where $\varphi(l)=-\epsilon_l l$ and $\varphi(-l)=\epsilon_{\gamma(l)}\gamma(l)$, for $1\le l\le k$. It is easy to check that $\varphi:[\pm M]\to[\pm M]$ is a bijection, so we shall regard $\varphi$ as a permutation of $[\pm M]$. Indeed, letting $\epsilon$ be the permutation of $[\pm M]$ given by $\epsilon(k)=\epsilon_k k$, we may write $\varphi=\epsilon\gamma\delta$ using the notation of §2.3. Thus we may write

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{Tr}(U^{(\epsilon_1,\eta_1)}B_1\cdots U^{(\epsilon_k,\eta_k)}B_k)\\ &\quad=\sum_{\substack{j_1,\ldots,j_k\\ j_{-1},\ldots,j_{-k}}}u^{(\eta_1)}_{j_1j_{-1}}b^{(1)}_{j_{\varphi(1)}j_{\varphi(-1)}}\cdots u^{(\eta_k)}_{j_kj_{-k}}b^{(k)}_{j_{\varphi(k)}j_{\varphi(-k)}}.\end{aligned}$$

Now let us return to $\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}(W_1)\cdots\mathrm{Tr}(W_R))=\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}(W_1)\cdots\mathrm{Tr}(W_M)\mathfrak{b})$ where $\mathfrak{b}=\mathrm{Tr}(B_{M+1})\cdots\mathrm{Tr}(B_{M+R-r})$. Now we let $\gamma$ be the permutation with cycle decomposition $(1,\ldots,M_1)(M_1+1,\ldots,M_2)\cdots(M_{r-1}+1,\ldots,M)$. Then we have, using the same reasoning as above,

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}(W_1)\cdots\mathrm{Tr}(W_R))\\ &\quad=\sum_{\substack{j_1,\ldots,j_M\\ j_{-1},\ldots,j_{-M}}}\mathrm{E}\left(u^{(\eta_1)}_{j_1j_{-1}}b^{(1)}_{j_{\varphi(1)}j_{\varphi(-1)}}\cdots u^{(\eta_M)}_{j_Mj_{-M}}b^{(M)}_{j_{\varphi(M)}j_{\varphi(-M)}}\mathfrak{b}\right)\\ &\quad=\sum_{\substack{j_1,\ldots,j_M\\ j_{-1},\ldots,j_{-M}}}\mathrm{E}\left(u^{(\eta_1)}_{j_1j_{-1}}\cdots u^{(\eta_M)}_{j_Mj_{-M}}\right)\mathrm{E}\left(b^{(1)}_{j_{\varphi(1)}j_{\varphi(-1)}}\cdots b^{(M)}_{j_{\varphi(M)}j_{\varphi(-M)}}\mathfrak{b}\right).\end{aligned}$$

We let $\boldsymbol{j}=(j_{-M},\ldots,j_{-1},j_1,\ldots,j_M)$. Recall that we let $\delta$ be the permutation of $[\pm M]$ given by $\delta(k)=-k$. Also if $\pi$ is a permutation

of $[M]$ we make $\pi$ a permutation of $[\pm M]$ by setting $\pi(-k) = -k$ for $k > 0$. Then for pairings $p, q \in \mathcal{P}_2(M)$, $p\delta q\delta$ is a permutation of $[\pm M]$. By Proposition 12 we can write

$$\mathrm{E}\left(u^{(\eta_1)}_{j_1 j_{-1}} \cdots u^{(\eta_M)}_{j_M j_{-M}}\right) = \sum_{p,q \in \mathcal{P}_2^{\eta}(M)} \delta^{\boldsymbol{j}}_{\boldsymbol{j} \circ p\delta q\delta} \Phi_N(p,q).$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}(W_1)\cdots\mathrm{Tr}(W_R))\\ &\quad= \sum_{p,q\in\mathcal{P}_2^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(M)} \Phi_N(p,q) \sum_{\boldsymbol{j}} \delta^{\boldsymbol{j}}_{\boldsymbol{j}\circ p\delta q\delta}\, \mathrm{E}\left(b^{(1)}_{j_{\varphi(1)}j_{\varphi(-1)}} \cdots b^{(M)}_{j_{\varphi(M)}j_{\varphi(-M)}} \mathfrak{b}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Let $\tau = \varphi^{-1} p\delta q\delta\varphi \in \mathcal{P}_2(\pm M)$. Then

$$\sum_{\boldsymbol{j}=\boldsymbol{j}\circ p\delta q\delta} b^{(1)}_{j_{\varphi(1)}j_{\varphi(-1)}} \cdots b^{(M)}_{j_{\varphi(M)}j_{\varphi(-M)}} = \sum_{\boldsymbol{i}=\boldsymbol{i}\circ\tau} b^{(1)}_{i_1 i_{-1}} \cdots b^{(M)}_{i_M i_{-M}}.$$

From Lemma 7 (see [MP, Lemma 5]) there exist a permutation $\pi(p,q) = \pi(\tau)$ from $S_M$ and $\lambda \in \{-1,1\}^M$ such that

$$\sum_{\boldsymbol{i}=\boldsymbol{i}\circ\tau} b^{(1)}_{i_1 i_{-1}} \cdots b^{(M)}_{i_M i_{-M}} = \mathrm{Tr}_{\pi(p,q)}(B_1^{(\lambda_1)}, \ldots, B_M^{(\lambda_M)}),$$

with $\pi(p,q)$ constructed as in §2.3, (see the discussion preceding Lemma 7). Thus

$$\begin{aligned}(11)\qquad &\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}(W_1)\cdots\mathrm{Tr}(W_R))\\ &\quad= \sum_{p,q\in\mathcal{P}_2^{\eta}(M)} \Phi_N(p,q)\, \mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}_{\pi(p,q)}(B_1^{(\lambda_1)}, \ldots, B_M^{(\lambda_M)})\mathfrak{b}).\end{aligned}$$

Let us note that if $(i)$ is a singleton of $\pi(p,q)$ i.e. a cycle of length 1, then $(i)(-i)$ are cycles of $\tilde{p}\delta$ where $\tilde{p} = \varphi^{-1}p\delta q\delta\varphi$ and thus $(i,-i)$ is a cycle of $\tilde{p}$ and hence $(\varphi(i),\varphi(-i))$ is a cycle of $p\delta q\delta$, which in turn implies that $\varphi(i)$ and $\varphi(-i)$ have the same sign, i.e. either both are positive or both negative. Suppose that both $\varphi(i) = -\epsilon_i i$ and $\varphi(-i) = \epsilon_{\gamma(i)}\gamma(i)$ are positive then $\epsilon_i = -\epsilon_{\gamma(i)}$. Also $p(\varphi(i)) = \varphi(-i)$ implies that $\eta_i = \eta_{\varphi(i)} = -\eta_{\varphi(-i)} = -\eta_{\gamma(i)}$, because $p \in \mathcal{P}^{\eta}(M)$. Thus we have $(\epsilon_i, \eta_i) = -(\epsilon_{\gamma(i)}, \eta_{\gamma(i)})$. When both $\varphi(i)$ and $\varphi(-i)$ are negative we get the same conclusion: $(\epsilon_i, \eta_i) = -(\epsilon_{\gamma(i)}, \eta_{\gamma(i)})$ (except working with $q$). Thus by condition $(c)$, we have that when $(i)$ is a singleton of $\pi(p,q)$, we have $\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}(B_i)) = 0$.

Given $p, q \in \mathcal{P}_2(M)$, we claim that

$$\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}_{\pi(p,q)}(B_1^{(\lambda_1)}, \ldots, B_M^{(\lambda_M)})\mathfrak{b}) = O(N^{M/2})$$

with equality only when $\pi(p,q)$ is a pairing of $[M]$. Indeed, let $s$ be the number of singletons of $\pi(p,q)$. By the previous paragraph if $(i)$ is a singleton of $\pi(p,q)$ we have $\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}(B_i)) = 0$. So by Proposition $5(ii)$

$$\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}_{\pi(p,q)}(B_1^{(\lambda_1)}, \ldots, B_M^{(\lambda_M)})\mathfrak{b}) = O(N^t)$$

where $t = \#(\pi(p,q)) - s$. Thus $t \leq (M-s)/2 \leq M/2$ with equality only if all cycles of $\pi(p,q)$ have length 2, i.e. $\pi(p,q)$ is a pairing. Recall from equation (6) that $\Phi_N(p,q) = O(N^{-M+\#(pq)/2})$. So

$$\Phi_N(p,q)\,\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}_{\pi(p,q)}(B_1^{(\lambda_1)}, \ldots, B_M^{(\lambda_M)})\mathfrak{b}) = O(N^{-M+\#(pq)/2+t}). \tag{12}$$

Combining this with (11) we get that

$$\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}(W_1)\cdots\mathrm{Tr}(W_R)) = O(1)$$

as claimed. □

*Remark* 19. Let us return to equation (11) to extract a few observations. Let $\boldsymbol{A}(W_1, \ldots, W_r) = \{p \in \mathcal{P}_2^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(M) : \pi(p,p) \text{ is a pairing}\}$. For $p \in \boldsymbol{A}(W_1, \ldots, W_r)$ , we have that $\Phi_N(p,p) = O(N^{\frac{-M}{2}})$. By Proposition 5 $(ii)$ we have for $p \in \boldsymbol{A}(W_1, \ldots, W_r)$ that

$$\begin{aligned} & N^{-M/2}\,\mathrm{E}\left(\mathrm{Tr}_{\pi(p,p)}(B_1^{(\lambda_1)}\cdots B_M^{(\lambda_M)})\mathfrak{b}\right) \\ &= N^{-M/2}\,\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}_{\pi(p,p)}(B_1^{(\lambda_1)}\cdots B_M^{(\lambda_M)}))\cdot\mathrm{E}(\mathfrak{b}) + O(N^{-M/2-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Denoting

$$\mathcal{E}(p, W_1, \ldots, W_r) = \Phi_N(p,p)\,\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}_{\pi(p,p)}(B_1^{(\lambda_1)}\cdots B_M^{(\lambda_M)})),$$

the equality above and equations (11), and (12) give that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}(W_1)\cdots\mathrm{Tr}(W_R)) \\ &= \sum_{p\in\boldsymbol{A}(W_1,\ldots,W_r)} \mathcal{E}(p, W_1, \ldots, W_r)\,\mathrm{E}(\mathfrak{b}) + o(1). \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Note also that $\mathcal{E}(p, W_1, \ldots, W_r) = O(1)$ for all $p \in \boldsymbol{A}(W_1, \ldots, W_r)$.

□

**Corollary 20.** *The ensembles $\{U_N, U_N^*\}_N$ and $\{U_N^t, \overline{U}_N\}_N$ are asymptotically free.*

*Proof.* By taking $\mathcal{A}$ to be the ensemble given by the identity matrices, property $(i)$ in the proof of Theorem 18 implies that

$$\mathrm{E}\left(\mathrm{Tr}\left(U^{p_1}\cdot(U^t)^{p_2}\cdots U^{p_{2M-1}}(U^t)^{p_{2M}}\right)\right) = O(1).$$

Since both $\{U_N, U_N^*\}_N$ and $\{U_N^t, \overline{U}_N\}_N$ satisfy condition $(i')$ from Definition 1, it suffices to show that for any non-zero integers $p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_{2M}$, we have

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \mathrm{E}\left(\mathrm{tr}\left(U^{p_1}\cdot(U^t)^{p_2}\cdots U^{p_{2M-1}}(U^t)^{p_{2M}}\right)\right) = 0.$$

but this follows from our first remark, hence the conclusion. □

*Remark* 21. For $U$ a Haar distributed random unitary, $\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{tr}(U^n)) = 0$ for all nonzero integers $n$, therefore the definition of free independence and Corollary 20 give

$$\lim_{N\longrightarrow\infty} \mathrm{E}(\mathrm{tr}((U^{(\varepsilon,\eta)})^m(U^{(\varepsilon',\eta')})^n)) = \delta_m^n\delta_\varepsilon^{-\varepsilon'}\delta_\eta^{-\eta'}.$$

**Corollary 22.** *If $\mathcal{A}$ is an ensemble of random matrices with the $t$-bounded cumulants property and is independent from $\mathfrak{U}$, then $\mathfrak{U}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ satisfy equation* (4) *from Definition 3.*

*Proof.* By Theorem 18 $\mathcal{A}\cup\mathfrak{U}$ has a bounded second order $t$-distribution. By Lemma 15, $\mathfrak{U}$ is orthogonally invariant so we can apply part $(ii)$ of Theorem 9 to conclude that $\mathfrak{U}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ satisfy equation (4).

□

**Lemma 23.** *Suppose $\mathcal{A}$ is an ensemble of random matrices independent from $\mathfrak{U}$ and with the $t$-bounded cumulants property. Let $r \geq 3$ and $m_0, m_1, \ldots, m_r$ be a strictly increasing sequence of positive integers such that $m_0 = 0$ and let $W_1, \ldots, W_r$ be simplified words in $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathfrak{U}$ such that each $W_i$ is a product*

$$W_i = U^{(\epsilon_{m_i+1},\eta_{m_i+1})}A_{m_i+1}\cdots U^{(\epsilon_{m_{i+1}},\eta_{m_{i+1}})}A_{m_{i+1}}$$

*for some $(\epsilon_i, \eta_i) \in \{1,-1\}^2$. Then*

$$\lim_{N\longrightarrow\infty} k_r(\mathrm{Tr}(W_1),\ldots,\mathrm{Tr}(W_r)) = 0$$

*Proof.* Denote by $\mathcal{P}_{1,2}(r)$ the set of all partitions on $[r]$ whose blocks have no more than 2 elements. To prove the lemma it suffices to show that we have

$$\lim_{N\longrightarrow\infty} \mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}(W_1)\cdots\mathrm{Tr}(W_r)) - \sum_{\pi\in\mathcal{P}_{1,2}(r)} k_\pi(\mathrm{Tr}(W_1),\ldots,\mathrm{Tr}(W_r)) = 0, \tag{14}$$

as this will inductively force all cumulants higher than 2 to vanish.

By Remark 19 we have that

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}(W_1,\ldots,W_r)) - \sum_{p\in \boldsymbol{A}(W_1,\ldots,W_r)} \Phi(p,p)\,\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}_{\pi(p,p)}(A_1,\ldots,A_{m_r})) = 0$$

where $\boldsymbol{A}(W_1,\ldots,W_r) = \{p \in \mathcal{P}_2^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(m_r) \mid \pi(p,p) \text{ is a pairing } \}$.

Thus it suffices to show that

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \sum_{\pi\in\mathcal{P}_{1,2}(l)} k_\pi(\mathrm{Tr}(W_1),\ldots,\mathrm{Tr}(W_r)) - \sum_{p\in \boldsymbol{A}(W_1,\ldots,W_r)} \Phi(p,p)\,\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}_{\pi(p,p)}(A_1,\ldots,A_{m_r})) = 0.$$

Let $\gamma$ be the permutation of $[m_r]$ with the $r$ cycles

$$(1,2,\ldots,m_1)(m_1+1,\ldots,m_2)\cdots(m_{r-1}+1,\ldots,m_r),$$

and let $\overline{\gamma}$ be the partition of $[\pm m_r]$ with $r$ blocks $B_1,\ldots,B_r$ with

$$B_k = \{-m_k,\ldots,-(m_{k-1}+1)\} \cup \{m_{k-1}+1,\ldots,m_k\}.$$

The blocks of the partition $\overline{\gamma}$ are the union of a cycle of $\gamma$ with the image of the cycle under the map $\delta$. For $l,s \in [r]$, let $\overline{\gamma}_{l,s} = \overline{\gamma}_{|B_l\cup B_s}$.

Let $p \in \mathbf{A}(W_1,\ldots,W_r)$ and suppose that $p\delta p\delta \vee \overline{\gamma}$ has the blocks $C_1,\ldots,C_t$. Each $C_j$ is a union of blocks of $\overline{\gamma}$, hence $p$ determines a partition $\rho(p) \in \mathcal{P}(r)$, with blocks $D_1,\ldots,D_t$ given by $l \in D_j$ if and only if $B_l \subset C_j$.

Let $\mathcal{W}_j = \{W_k; B_k \subseteq C_j\}$. We will first show that

$$\mathcal{E}(p,W_1,\ldots,W_r) = \mathcal{E}(p_{|C_1},\mathcal{W}_1)\cdots\mathcal{E}(p_{|C_t},\mathcal{W}_t) + o(1). \tag{15}$$

To prove (15) it suffices to prove that the blocks $C_j$ are invariant under the permutation $\pi(p,p)$; because we have the Möbius function of equation (6) is multiplicative in the sense of [NS, Lecture 1]. But, as described in Section 2.3, the blocks of $\pi(p,p)$ are obtained by taking the absolute value of the elements of the cycles of $\delta\widetilde{p}$, for $\widetilde{p}$ defined as in the proof of Theorem 18, i.e. $\widetilde{p} = \varphi^{-1}p\delta p\delta\varphi$. But, by construction, $\varphi(B_l) = B_l$ (from the definition of $\varphi$) and $\delta(B_l) = B_l$ for all $B_l$; and $p(C_j) = C_j$. Therefore $\delta\widetilde{p}(C_j) = C_j$ for all $C_j$. This establishes equation (15).

Next, we shall show that each $C_j$ contains at most two blocks of $\overline{\gamma}$, which will show that $\rho(p) \in P_{1,2}(r)$. In Corollary 22 of [MP] we showed that if $\pi(p,p)$ (there denoted $\pi_{p\cdot\epsilon p}$) is a pairing then each block of $p\vee\gamma$ contains at most two cycles of $\gamma$. The connection between $p\vee\gamma$ and $p\delta p\delta\vee\overline{\gamma}$ is quite simple. With $p\vee\gamma$ we have a partition of $[M]$; if we reflect this to a partition of $[-M]$ by applying $\delta$ and then join each

block of $p \vee \gamma$ to its image under $\delta$ we then get $p\delta p\delta \vee \overline{\gamma}$. Thus each $C_j$ contains at most two blocks of $\overline{\gamma}$.

Thus we have

$$\sum_{p \in \mathbf{A}(W_1,\ldots,W_r)} \mathcal{E}(p, W_1, \ldots, W_r) = \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}_{1,2}(r)} \sum_{\substack{p \in \mathbf{A}(W_1,\ldots,W_r) \\ \rho(p)=\pi}} \mathcal{E}(p, W_1, \ldots, W_r)$$

and thereby have reduced the proof of to showing that

$$\sum_{\substack{p \in \mathbf{A}(W_1,\ldots,W_r) \\ \rho(p)=\pi}} \mathcal{E}(p, W_1, \ldots, W_r) = k_\pi(\mathrm{Tr}(W_1), \ldots, \mathrm{Tr}(W_r)) + o(1). \tag{16}$$

Since $\mathcal{E}(p, W_1, \ldots, W_r)$ factorizes, up to $o(1)$, over the blocks of $p\delta p\delta \vee \overline{\gamma}$, it suffices to show that if $(j)$ , and respectively $(k, l)$, are blocks of $\rho(p)$, then

$$k_1(\mathrm{Tr}(W_j)) = \sum_{p \in \mathbf{A}(W_j)} \mathcal{E}(p, W_j) + o(1),$$

and respectively

$$k_2(\mathrm{Tr}(W_l), \mathrm{Tr}(W_k)) = \sum_{\substack{p \in \mathbf{A}(W_l, W_k) \\ p\delta p\delta \vee \overline{\gamma}_{l,k} = \mathbf{1}}} \mathcal{E}(p, W_l, W_k) + o(1).$$

The first equality follows from the definition of $\mathcal{E}(p, W_j)$ and equation (13). For the second equality, according to equation (13), we have

$$\begin{aligned} k_1(\mathrm{Tr}(W_l))k_1(\mathrm{Tr}(W_k)) &= \sum_{p \in \mathbf{A}(W_l)} \mathcal{E}(p, W_l) \cdot \sum_{p \in \mathbf{A}(W_k)} \mathcal{E}(p, W_k) + o(1) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{p \in \mathbf{A}(W_l, W_k) \\ p\delta p\delta \vee \overline{\gamma}_{l,k} = (B_l, B_k)}} \mathcal{E}(p, W_l, W_k) + o(1). \end{aligned}$$

The set $\mathbf{A}(W_l, W_k)$ is the disjoint union of the sets $\{p \in \mathbf{A}(W_l, W_k) : p\delta p\delta \vee \overline{\gamma}_{l,k} = \mathbf{1}_{B_l \cup B_k}\}$ and $\{p \in \mathbf{A}(W_l, W_k) : p\delta p\delta \vee \overline{\gamma}_{l,k} = (B_l, B_k)\}$, therefore

$$\begin{aligned} k_2(\mathrm{Tr}(W_l), \mathrm{Tr}(W_k)) &= E(\mathrm{Tr}(W_l)\,\mathrm{Tr}(W_k)) - k_1(\mathrm{Tr}(W_l))k_1(\mathrm{Tr}(W_k)) \\ &= \sum_{p \in \mathbf{A}(W_l, W_k)} \mathcal{E}(p, W_l, W_k) - \sum_{\substack{p \in \mathbf{A}(W_l, W_k) \\ p\delta p\delta \vee \overline{\gamma}_{l,k} = (B_l, B_k)}} \mathcal{E}(p, W_l, W_k) + o(1) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{p \in \mathbf{A}(W_l, W_k) \\ p\delta p\delta \vee \overline{\gamma}_{l,k} = \mathbf{1}_{B_l \cup B_k}}} \mathcal{E}(p, W_l, W_k) + o(1). \end{aligned}$$

This proves equation (16) and thus completes the proof.

□

**Theorem 24.** *If $\mathcal{A}$ has a second order limit t-distribution and is independent from $\mathfrak{U}$, then $\mathfrak{U}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ are asymptotically real second order free.*

*Proof.* According to Corollary 22, the ensembles $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathfrak{U}$ satisfy equation (4), hence we only need to prove that $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathfrak{U}$ has a second order limit $t$-distribution. That is, we must show that any polynomials, $W_1, \ldots, W_R$, with complex coefficients in elements from $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}^t \cup \mathfrak{U}$ satisfy the conditions $(i')$–$(iii')$ from Definition 1(2).

From Lemma 17, each $W_i$ has the property

$$\mathrm{Tr}(W_i) = c_{i,0} + c_{i,1}\,\mathrm{Tr}(W_{i,1}) + \cdots + c_{i,m(i)}\,\mathrm{Tr}(W_{i,m(i)})$$

for some $c_{i,k}$, depending on $N$, and some simplified words, $W_{i,k}$, in $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}^t$ and $\mathfrak{U}$. Since $\mathcal{A}$ has a second order limit $t$-distribution, it follows that the limit $\lim_{N\longrightarrow\infty} c_{i,k}$ exists and it is finite, so using the multilinearity of the cumulant functions, so only need to show the result for $W_1, \ldots, W_R$ as in expressions from (8).

Since the hypotheses of Theorem 18 are weaker than our present theorem, we then have that $\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}(W)) = O(1)$; so Property $(i')$ holds.

We have assumed that $\mathcal{A}$ has a second order limit $t$-distribution; by Remark 21 $\mathfrak{U}$ has a limit distribution, so all the terms of the form

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n}[\prod_{i=1}^{n}\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{tr}(C_i \cdot D_{k-i})) + \prod_{i=1}^{n}\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{tr}(C_i \cdot D_{i-k}^t))]\}$$

from equation (4) have a limit, hence property $(ii')$ is satisfied.

To show that Property $(iii')$ is also satisfied, let us remember that for each $r < j \leq R$, $W_j$ is a centered polynomial with complex coefficients in elements from $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}^t$. Since $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathfrak{U}$ satisfy equation (4), $\lim\limits_{N\longrightarrow\infty} k_2(\mathrm{Tr}(W_i), \mathrm{Tr}(W_j)) = 0$ whenever $i \leq r$ and $r < j \leq R$, thus

$$\begin{aligned}(17)\quad &\lim_{N\longrightarrow\infty}\Big\{\sum_{\pi\in\mathcal{P}_{1,2}(R)} k_\pi(\mathrm{Tr}(W_1), \ldots, \mathrm{Tr}(W_R)) \\ &- \sum_{\pi\in P_{1,2}(r)} k_\pi(\mathrm{Tr}(W_1), \ldots, \mathrm{Tr}(W_r)) \sum_{\sigma\in P_{1,2}(R-r)} k_\sigma(\mathrm{Tr}(W_{r+1}), \ldots, \mathrm{Tr}(W_R))\Big\} \\ &= \ 0.\end{aligned}$$

Also $\mathrm{Tr}(W_{r+1}), \ldots, \mathrm{Tr}(W_R)$ have the following properties: the first order cumulants are zero (from the choice of $W_1, \ldots, W_R$ ); the second order cumulants have a finite limit; and their cumulants of order higher

than 2 are $o(1)$ (since the ensemble $\mathcal{A}$ has a second order limit $t$ -distribution). Thus we have that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{E}\left(\mathrm{Tr}(W_{r+1})\cdots\mathrm{Tr}(W_R)\right) \\ &\quad = \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{P}_{1,2}(R-r)} k_\sigma(\mathrm{Tr}(W_{r+1}),\ldots,\mathrm{Tr}(W_R)) + o(1). \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

Finally, equations (13) and (14) give

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{E}(\,\mathrm{Tr}(W_1)\cdots\mathrm{Tr}(W_R)) \\ &\quad = \sum_{\pi\in P_{1,2}(r)} k_\pi(\mathrm{Tr}(W_1),\ldots,\mathrm{Tr}(W_r))\cdot \mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}(W_{r+1}\cdots\mathrm{Tr}(W_R)) + o(1) \end{aligned}$$

so the conclusion follows from equations (17) and (18).

□

Since the ensemble generated by the identity matrices has a second order limit $t$-distribution, Theorem 24 implies the following corollary.

**Corollary 25.** *The Haar distributed random unitary $U$ has a second order limit $t$-distribution.*

An immediate consequence of Theorem 9, Theorem 24 from above and Corollary 21 from [MSS] is the following corollary.

**Corollary 26.** *Suppose that, $\mathcal{A}$ is an ensemble of random matrices with a second order limit $t$-distribution, that $\mathcal{O}$ is an ensemble of Haar distributed random orthogonal matrices, that $\mathcal{U}$ is an ensemble of Haar distributed random unitary matrices, and furthermore suppose that $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{O}$, and $\mathcal{U}$ are independent. Then $\mathcal{O}$ and $\mathcal{U}$ are both real and complex second order free, $\mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ are complex second order free, and $\mathcal{O}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ are real second order free.*

There is no contradiction in $\mathcal{O}$ and $\mathcal{U}$ being both asymptotically complex and real second order free, since, from Remark 21, all traces from the second summation of equation (4) cancel asymptotically for Haar distributed random unitaries. In the next section we will show that a similar situation takes place for a larger class of random matrices.

## 4. Unitarily-Invariant Random Matrices

**Theorem 27.** *Let $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ be two independent ensembles of random matrices such that $\mathcal{A}_1$ is unitarily invariant and has the bounded cumulants property and $\mathcal{A}_2$ has the $t$-bounded cumulants property. Then the ensemble $\mathcal{A}_1\cup\mathcal{A}_2$ has the $t$-bounded cumulants property.*

*Proof.* We shall start with an ad-hoc refinement of Lemma 17. More precisely, if $W$ is a word in polynomials with complex coefficients in elements from $\mathcal{A}_2 \cup \mathcal{A}_2^t$ and $\mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}_1^t$, then

$$\mathrm{Tr}(W) = c_0 + c_1 \,\mathrm{Tr}(W_1) + \ldots c_m \,\mathrm{Tr}(W_m) \tag{19}$$

for some $c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_m$ polynomials with complex coefficients in expectations of normalized traces of products of elements either from $\mathcal{A}_1$ or from $\mathcal{A}_2 \cup \mathcal{A}_2^t$, and $W_1, \ldots, W_m$ either centered polynomials with complex coefficients in elements from $\mathcal{A}_2$, or of the form

$$W_i = (UA_1U^*)^{(\epsilon_1)} B_1 \cdots (UA_sU^*)^{(\epsilon_s)} B_s$$

where $\epsilon_i \in \{1, -1\}$, $A_i$'s are centered polynomials of elements from $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $B_i$'s are either centered polynomials of elements from $\mathcal{A}_2 \cup \mathcal{A}_2^t$ or identity matrices, last situation possible only if $\epsilon_i \neq \epsilon_{i+1}$, for $i < s$, respectively if $\epsilon_1 \neq \epsilon_s$, for $i = s$.

Using the unitary invariance of $\mathcal{A}_1$, it suffices to show (19) for $W = (UA_1U^*)^{(\epsilon_1)} B_1 \cdots (UA_nU^*)^{(\epsilon_n)} B_n$ with $A_k$'s and $B_k$'s arbitrary polynomials in elements from $\mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}_1^t$, respectively in elements from $\mathcal{A}_2 \cup \mathcal{A}_2^t$. Similarly to Lemma 17, we will use induction on $(n, a, b)$, where $a$, respectively $b$ are the numbers of $A_k$'s, respectively $B_k$'s from the expansion of $W$ not satisfying the conditions from (19). For $n = 1$ or $a = b = 0$, the result is trivial. For the induction step, if $a \neq 0$, then, using traciality, we can suppose that $A_n$ is not centered. Then, using again the notation $\mathring{A} = A - \mathrm{E}(\mathrm{tr}(A))I$,

$$\begin{aligned} W = (UA_1U^*)^{(\epsilon_1)} B_1 \cdots (U\mathring{A}_nU^*)^{(\epsilon_n)} B_n \\ + \mathrm{E}(\mathrm{tr}(A_n))(UA_1U^*)^{(\epsilon_1)} B_1 \cdots (UA_{n-1}U^*)^{(\epsilon_{n-1})} B_{n-1} B_n \end{aligned}$$

and the first term has fewer not centered $A_k$'s, while the second term has length strictly less than $W$. If $b \neq 0$, then similarly we can suppose that $B_n$ does not satisfy the conditions from (19). Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Tr}(W) = \mathrm{Tr}((UA_1U^*)^{(\epsilon_1)} B_1 \cdots (UA_nU^*)^{(\epsilon_n)} \mathring{B}_n) \\ + \mathrm{E}(\mathrm{tr}(B_n)) \,\mathrm{Tr}((UA_nU^*)^{(\epsilon_n)} (UA_1U^*)^{(\epsilon_1)} B_1 \cdots (UA_{n-1}U^*)^{(\epsilon_{n-1})} B_{n-1}) \end{aligned}$$

and both the arguments of Tr from the first term have fewer $B_k$'s not satisfying the conditions from (19) than in the expression of $W$.

Since the ensembles $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2 \cup \mathcal{A}_2^t$ have second order bounded distributions, each $c_k$ is bounded in $N$. Therefore it suffices to show that $W_1, W_2 \ldots, W_R$ satisfy the condition from Definition1(1), where $W_i$'s are defined as follows. For $r \leq R$ and $1 \leq t \leq R - r$,

$$W_{r+t} = B_{M+t}$$

with $B_{M+t}$ a centered polynomial in elements from $\mathcal{A}_2$. For $1 \leq s \leq r$,

$$W_s = (UA_{M_{s-1}+1}U^*)^{\epsilon(M_{s-1}+1)}B_{M_{s-1}+1}\cdots(UA_{M_s}U^*)^{\epsilon(M_s)}B_{M_s}$$

where given positive integers $l_1, l_2, \ldots, l_r$, we set $M_0 = 0$, $M_s = M_{s-1} + l_s$, $M_r = M$, and $\varepsilon_i \in \{1, -1\}$, each $A_i$ are centered polynomials of elements from $\mathcal{A}_1$ and each $B_i$ is either a centered polynomial of elements from $\mathcal{A}_2$ or an identity matrix, but $B_i$ can be an identity matrix only if $\epsilon_i = -\epsilon_{i+1}$ , if $i < M_s$, or if $\epsilon_{M_{s-1}+1} = -\epsilon_{M_s}$, if $i = M_s$.

To show that $\mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}_2$ has the $t$-bounded cumulants property, as in the proof of Theorem 18 it suffices to show that

$$\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}(W_1)\cdots\mathrm{Tr}(W_R)) = O(1). \tag{20}$$

Note that, for $A = (a_{i,j})_{i,j=1}^N \in \mathcal{A}_1$, the $(i_1, i_2)$-entries of $UAU^*$ and $(UAU^*)^t$ are, respectively,

$$[UAU^*]_{i_1,i_2} = \sum_{i_{-1},i_{-2}=1}^{N} u_{i_1,i_{-1}}a_{i_{-1},i_{-2}}\overline{u_{i_2,i_{-2}}}$$

$$\left[(UAU^*)^t\right]_{i_1,i_2} = \sum_{i_{-1},i_{-2}=1}^{N} u_{i_2,i_{-1}}a_{i_{-1},i_{-2}}\overline{u_{i_1,i_{-2}}} = [UAU^*]_{i_2,i_1}\,,$$

henceforth

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Tr}(W_s) &= \mathrm{Tr}((UA_{M_{s-1}+1}U^*)^{\epsilon(M_{s-1}+1)}B_{M_{s-1}+1}\cdots(UA_{M_s}U^*)^{\epsilon(M_s)}B_{M_s}) \\ &= \sum_{\boldsymbol{i}(s)}\Big(\prod_{k=M_{s-1}}^{M_s} u_{i_{2k+1},i_{-(2k+1)}}\cdot a^{(k+1)}_{i_{-(2k+1)},i_{-(2k+2)}}\cdot\overline{u_{i_{2k+2},i_{-(2k+2)}}}\cdot b^{(k)}_{i_{\psi(k)},i_{\psi(-k)}}\Big)\end{aligned}$$

where $\boldsymbol{i}(s) = (i_{2M_{s-1}+1}, i_{-(2M_{s-1}+1)}, \ldots i_{2M_s}, i_{-2M_s})$ and the map $\psi$ is given by

- if $M_{s-1} < k \leq M_s$, then $\psi(k) = \begin{cases} 2k-1, & \text{if } \epsilon(k) = 1 \\ 2k, & \text{if } \epsilon(k) = -1 \end{cases}$
- if $M_{s-1} < k < M_s$, then $\psi(-k) = \begin{cases} 2k+1, & \text{if } \epsilon(k+1) = 1 \\ 2k+2, & \text{if } \epsilon(k+1) = -1 \end{cases}$
- $\psi(-M_s) = \begin{cases} 2M_{s-1}+1, & \text{if } \epsilon(1) = 1 \\ 2M_{s-1}+2, & \text{if } \epsilon(1) = -1. \end{cases}$

Let $\mathcal{P}_2'(2M) = \{p \in P_2(2M) : l + p(l) = 1(\text{mod } 2) \text{ for all } \ l \in [2M]\}$. Expanding as above and applying Proposition 12, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}(W_1)\,\mathrm{Tr}(W_2)\cdots\mathrm{Tr}(W_r)) \\
&= \sum_{\boldsymbol{i}} \mathrm{E}(\prod_{k=1}^{M} u_{i_{2k+1},i_{-(2k+1)}} \cdot a^{(k+1)}_{i_{-(2k+1)},i_{-(2k+2)}} \cdot \overline{u_{i_{2k+2},i_{-(2k+2)}}} \cdot b^{(k)}_{i_{\psi(k)},i_{\psi(-k)}}) \\
&= \sum_{\boldsymbol{i}} [\mathrm{E}(u_{i_1,i_{-1}}\overline{u_{i_2,i_{-2}}}\cdots u_{i_{2M-1},i_{-2M+1}}\overline{u_{i_{2M},i_{-2M}}}) \\
&\qquad \cdot \mathrm{E}(a^{(1)}_{i_{-1},i_{-2}}\cdots a^{(M)}_{i_{-2M+1},i_{-2M}}) \cdot \mathrm{E}(b^{(1)}_{i_{\psi(1)},i_{\psi(-1)}}\cdots b^{(M)}_{i_{\psi(M)},i_{\psi(-M)}})] \\
&= \sum_{p,q\in\mathcal{P}_2'(2M)} \Phi_N(p,q) \cdot \sum_{\boldsymbol{i}=\boldsymbol{i}\circ p\delta q\delta} [\mathrm{E}(a^{(1)}_{i_{-1},i_{-2}}\cdots a^{(M)}_{i_{-2M+1},i_{-2M}}) \\
&\qquad\qquad \cdot \mathrm{E}(b^{(1)}_{i_{\psi(1)},i_{\psi(-1)}}\cdots b^{(M)}_{i_{\psi(M)},i_{\psi(-M)}})]
\end{aligned}$$

Since $p, q \in P_2'(2M)$, we have that $p$ acts only on $[2M]$, while $\delta q\delta$ acts only on $[-2M]$, hence the condition $\boldsymbol{i} = \boldsymbol{i}\circ p\delta q\delta$ is equivalent to $\boldsymbol{i} = \boldsymbol{i}\circ p$ and $\boldsymbol{i} = \boldsymbol{i}\circ \delta q\delta$.

Moreover, denoting $l_k = i_{\varphi(k)}$, the condition $\boldsymbol{i} = \boldsymbol{i}\circ p$ is equivalent to $\boldsymbol{l} = \boldsymbol{l}\circ\varphi^{-1}p\varphi$.

Consider the map $\omega : [\pm M] \longrightarrow [2M]$, given by

$$\omega(k) = \begin{cases} 2k, & \text{if } k < 0 \\ -2k+1, & \text{if } k > 0 \end{cases}$$

Denoting now $j_k = i_{-\omega(k)}$, the condition $\boldsymbol{i} = \boldsymbol{i}\circ\delta q\delta$ is equivalent to $\boldsymbol{j} = \boldsymbol{j}\circ\omega^{-1}q\omega$, hence we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\boldsymbol{i}=\boldsymbol{i}\circ p\delta q\delta} [\mathrm{E}(a^{(1)}_{i_{-1},i_{-2}}\cdots a^{(M)}_{i_{-2M+1},i_{-2M}}) \cdot \mathrm{E}(b^{(1)}_{i_{\psi(1)},i_{\psi(-1)}}\cdots b^{(M)}_{i_{\psi(M)},i_{\psi(-M)}})] \\
&\quad = \mathrm{E}(\sum_{\boldsymbol{j}=\boldsymbol{j}\circ\omega^{-1}q\omega} a^{(1)}_{j_1,j_{-1}}\cdots a^{(M)}_{j_M,j_{-M}}) \cdot \mathrm{E}(\sum_{\boldsymbol{l}=\boldsymbol{l}\circ\psi^{-1}p\psi} b^{(1)}_{l_1,l_{-1}}\cdots b^{(M)}_{l_M,l_{-M}})
\end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 7, there exist some $\sigma_1 \in S_M$ and some $\boldsymbol{\eta} \in \{-1,1\}^M$ such that

$$\sum_{\boldsymbol{l}=\boldsymbol{l}\circ\psi^{-1}p\psi} b^{(1)}_{l_1,l_{-1}}\cdots b^{(M)}_{l_M,l_{-M}} = \mathrm{Tr}_{\sigma_1}(B_1^{(\eta_1)}\cdots B_M^{(\eta_M)}).$$

From the definition of $\psi$ and since $p \in P_2'(M)$, we have that $l_k = l_{-k}$ implies $\epsilon_k = \epsilon_{-k}$, so if $(s)$ is a singleton of $\sigma_1$, then $B_s \neq I$. Henceforth, Proposition $5(i)$ gives that

$$\mathrm{E}(\sum_{\boldsymbol{l}=\boldsymbol{l}\circ\psi^{-1}p\psi} b^{(1)}_{l_1,l_{-1}}\cdots b^{(M)}_{l_M,l_{-M}}) = O(N^{-\frac{M}{2}})$$

Next, observe that $\omega^{-1}q\omega([M]) = [-M]$. Indeed, if $k > 0$, then we have $\omega(k) = 1(\text{mod } 2)$, hence $q\omega(k) = 0(\text{mod } 2)$ and $\omega^{-1}q\omega(k) < 0$. Therefore, according to Remark 8, there exists some $\sigma_2 \in S_M$ such that

$$\sum_{\boldsymbol{j}=\boldsymbol{j}\circ\omega^{-1}q\omega} a^{(1)}_{j_1,j_{-1}} \cdots a^{(M)}_{j_M,j_{-M}} = \mathrm{Tr}_{\sigma_2}(A_1 \cdots A_M).$$

and applying Proposition 5$(i)$ we obtain

$$\mathrm{E}(\sum_{\boldsymbol{j}=\boldsymbol{j}\circ\omega^{-1}q\omega} a^{(1)}_{j_1,j_{-1}} \cdots a^{(M)}_{j_M,j_{-M}}) = O(N^{-\frac{M}{2}}).$$

Since $\Phi_N(p,q) = O(N^M)$, Proposition 5$(ii)$ gives equation (20), hence the conclusion.

□

Taking $\mathcal{A}_2$ to consist only in scalar matrices, Theorem 27 has the following immediate consequence.

**Corollary 28.** *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a unitarily invariant ensemble of random matrices. If $\mathcal{A}$ has the bounded cumulants property, then it has the $t$-bounded cumulants property.*

Another relevant consequence of Theorem 27 is the result below.

**Corollary 29.** *If $\mathcal{A}$ is a ensemble of unitarily invariant random matrices with a limit distribution and the bounded cumulants property, then $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{A}^t = \{A^t : \ A \in \mathcal{A}\}$ are asymptotically free. In particular, the ensemble $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}^t$ has a limit distribution.*

*Proof.* Taking the ensemble $\mathcal{A}_2$ from Theorem 27 to consist only on scalar matrices, equation (20) implies that for all $A_1, \ldots, A_m$ centered polynomials in elements from $\mathcal{A}$,

$$\lim_{N\longrightarrow\infty} \mathrm{E}(\mathrm{tr}(A_1 A_2^t A_3 \cdots)) = 0$$

hence the conclusion. □

Note that if $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{A}$ is an ensemble of symmetric random matrices, then $\mathcal{B}$ is also contained in $\mathcal{A}^t$. This situation is discussed in Corollary 31 below. Note that in a non-commutative probability space $(\mathcal{C}, \varphi)$ an element $a$ with the property that $\varphi(a^n) = 0$ for all $n \geq 1$ is free from itself. For example a Haar unitary has this this property, but of course it is not $*$-free from itself.

**Lemma 30.** *Suppose that $\{B_N\}_N$ is an ensemble of random matrices with a limit distribution and $\beta = \lim_{N\longrightarrow\infty} E(\mathrm{tr}(B_N))$.*

(*i*) *If* $\{B_N\}_n$ *and* $\{B_N^*\}_n$ *are asymptotically free, then* $\{B_N - \beta I_N\}_N$ *converges to* 0 *in* $L^2(E \circ \mathrm{tr})$.

(*ii*) *If* $\{B_N\}_N$ *is asymptotically free from itself, then* $\{B_N - \beta I_N\}_N$ *converges to* 0 *in distribution with respect to* $E \circ \mathrm{tr}$, *but not necessarily in* $L^2(E \circ \mathrm{tr})$.

*Proof.* Suppose that $\{B_N\}_N$ and $\{B_N^*\}_N$ are asymptotically free. The definition implies that

$$\lim_{N\longrightarrow\infty} E(\mathrm{tr}((B_N - \beta I_N)(B_N - \beta I_N)^*))) \\ = \lim_{N\longrightarrow\infty} E(\mathrm{tr}((B_N - \beta I_N)) \cdot \lim_{N\longrightarrow\infty} E(\mathrm{tr}((B_N - \beta I_N)^*) = 0.$$

Suppose that $\{B_N\}_N$ is asymptotically free from itself. Then, for any positive integer $m$, we have that

$$\lim_{N\longrightarrow\infty} (E \circ \mathrm{tr})((B_N - \beta I_N)^{m+1}) \\ = \lim_{N\longrightarrow\infty} (E \circ \mathrm{tr})((B_N - \beta I_N)^m) \cdot \lim_{N\longrightarrow\infty} (E \circ \mathrm{tr})((B_N - \beta I_N)) = 0$$

For the last part, take $\{B_N\}_N = \{U + U^t\}_N$. Then $\{B_N\}_N$ is an ensemble of unitarily invariant random matrices and, according to Corollary 29, it is asymptotically free from $\{B_N^t\}_N = \{B_N\}_N$. Corollary 20 gives

$$\lim_{N\longrightarrow\infty} (E \circ \mathrm{tr})((U + U^t)(U + U^t)^*) = \\ \lim_{N\longrightarrow\infty} (E \circ \mathrm{tr})(UU^* + U(U^t)^* + (U^*U)^t + U^tU^*) = 2 \neq 0.$$

□

**Corollary 31.** *Suppose that* $\mathcal{A}$ *and* $\{B_N\}_N$ *are ensembles of unitarily invariant random matrices having limit distributions and the bounded cumulants property such that* $\{B_N\}_N \subset \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}^t$ *and let* $\beta = \lim_{N\longrightarrow\infty} E(\mathrm{tr}(B_N))$.

(*i*) *If* $\mathcal{A}$ *is closed under taking adjoints (i.e.* $A \in \mathcal{A}$ *implies* $A^* \in \mathcal{A}$*), then* $\{B_N - \beta I_N\}_N$ *converges to 0 in* $L^2(E \circ \mathrm{tr})$.

(*ii*) *If* $\mathcal{A}$ *is not closed under taking adjoints, then* $\{B_N - \beta I_N\}_N$ *converges to 0 in distribution with respect to* $E \circ \mathrm{tr}$, *but not necessarily in* $L^2(E \circ \mathrm{tr})$.

*Proof.* For part (i), since taking transposes and taking adjoints commute, it follows that if $\mathcal{A}$ is closed under taking adjoints, then so is $\mathcal{A}^t$ hence $\{B_N^*\}_N \subset \mathcal{A}^t$ is asymptotically free (according to Corollary 29) from $\{B_N\}_N \subset \mathcal{A}$, and the conclusion follows from Lemma 30 (*i*).

For part (*ii*), it suffices to note that the example from the proof of Lemma 30 (*ii*) is symmetric and unitarily invariant.

□

**Theorem 32.** *Let $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ be two independent ensembles of random matrices such that $\mathcal{A}_1$ is unitarily invariant and has a second order limit distribution and $\mathcal{A}_2$ has a second order limit t-distribution. Then the ensemble $\mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}_2$ has a second order limit t-distribution.*

*Proof.* Since the coefficients $c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_m$ from equation (19) are polynomials with complex coefficients in expectations of normalized traces of products of elements either from $\mathcal{A}_1$ or from $\mathcal{A}_2 \cup \mathcal{A}_2^t$, it follows that under present assumptions $\lim_{N\longrightarrow\infty} c_k$ exists and it is finite for all $k$, hence it suffices to show that the conditions $(i')$-$(iii')$ from Definition 1(2) hold true for $W_1, \ldots, W_R$ as in the proof of Theorem 27. More precisely, For $r \leq R$ and $1 \leq t \leq R - r$,

$$W_{r+t} = B_{M+t}$$

with $B_{M+t}$ a centered polynomial in elements from $\mathcal{A}_2$. For $1 \leq s \leq r$,

$$W_s = (UA_{M_{s-1}+1}U^*)^{\epsilon(M_{s-1}+1)} B_{M_{s-1}+1} \cdots (UA_{M_s}U^*)^{\epsilon(M_s)} B_{M_s}$$

where given positive integers $l_1, l_2, \ldots, l_r$, we set $M_0 = 0$, $M_s = M_{s-1} + l_s$, $M_r = M$, and $\varepsilon_i \in \{1, -1\}$, each $A_i$ are centered polynomials of elements from $\mathcal{A}_1$ and each $B_i$ is either a centered polynomial of elements from $\mathcal{A}_2$ or an identity matrix, but $B_i$ can be an identity matrix only if $\epsilon_i = -\epsilon_{i+1}$ , if $i < M_s$, or if $\epsilon_{M_{s-1}+1} = -\epsilon_{M_s}$, if $i = M_s$.

Property $(i')$ is an immediate consequence of equation (20), since the hypotheses of Theorem 27 are satisfied.

Since the ensemble $\mathcal{A}_1$ is unitarily invariant, it is also orthogonally invariant, so, from Theorem 9, the ensembles $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ satisfy equation (4), hence $k_2(\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}(W_i), \mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}(W_j)) = o(1)$ whenever $i \leq r < j$. The ensemble $\mathcal{A}_2$ has a second order limit $t$-distribution, so property $(ii')$ is proved if we show that $\lim_{N\longrightarrow\infty} k_2(\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}(W_i), \mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}(W_j))$ exists and it is finite for $i, j \leq r$. From Corollary 29, the ensembles $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_1^t$ are asymptotically free, so an alternating product of centered polynomials in elements from $\mathcal{A}_1$, respectively $\mathcal{A}_1^t$ is asymptotically centered, so we can suppose that $W_i = C_1 C_2 \cdots C_m$ and $W_j = D_1 D_2 \cdots D_n$ where if $k, p$ are odd then $C_k$ and $D_p$ are centered polynomials in elements from $\mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}_1^t$ and if $k, p$ are even, then $C_k$ and $D_p$ are centered polynomials in elements from $\mathcal{A}_2 \cup \mathcal{A}_2^t$. Equation (4) gives then:

$$\lim_{N\longrightarrow\infty} k_2(\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}(W_i), \mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Tr}(W_j)) - \\ \delta_{m,n} \cdot \sum_{k=1}^{n} [\prod_{l=1}^{n} \mathrm{E}(\mathrm{tr}(C_l \cdot D_{k-l})) + \prod_{l=1}^{n} \mathrm{E}(\mathrm{tr}(C_l \cdot D_{l-k}^t))]\} = 0$$

therefore property $(ii')$ from Definition 1(2) is proved if we show that $\lim_{N\longrightarrow\infty} \mathrm{tr}(C_k D_l)$ exists and it is finite for all $k, l$. If $k$ and $l$ have the same parity, the limit exists since from the hypothesis, respectively Corollary 29, the ensembles $\mathcal{A}_2 \cup \mathcal{A}_2^t$ and $\mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}_1^t$ have limit distributions. If $k$ and $l$ have different parities, then the unitary invariance of $\mathcal{A}_1$ gives (see, for example [MSS]) that $\mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}_1^t$ and $\mathcal{A}_2 \cup \mathcal{A}_2^t$ are asymptotically free, so the limit is zero.

For property $(iii')$, we need to show that

$$\lim_{N\longrightarrow\infty} k_3(\mathrm{Tr}(W_{i_1}), \ldots, \mathrm{Tr}(W_{i_s}) = 0 \tag{21}$$

whenever $s \geq 3$ and $1 \leq i_k \leq R$.

If the set $\{i_1, \ldots, i_s\}$ contains both elements less than $r$ and greater than $r$, note first that, from Theorem 27, the ensemble $\mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}_2$ has a second order bounded $t$-distribution. Therefore we can apply Proposition 5$(ii)$ to $W_1, \ldots, W_R$, which implies (21). If $i_k \leq r$ for all $k$, then (21) is given by Lemma 23. Finally, if $i_k > r$ for all $k$, then (21) is holds true since $\mathcal{A}_2$ has a second order limit $t$-distribution. □

Since ensembles of scalar matrices matrices have a second order limit $t$-distribution, Theorem 32 implies the following corollary.

**Corollary 33.** *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a unitarily invariant ensemble of random matrices. If $\mathcal{A}$ has a second order limit distribution, then it has a second order limit $t$-distribution.*

*Remark* 34. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an ensemble with a second order limit distribution. The ensemble

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{A}} = \{\int_{\mathcal{U}(N)} UAU^* d\mathcal{U}_N(U) : A \in \mathcal{A}\}$$

is unitarily invariant (from the properties of the Haar measure) and has a second order limit distribution (since $\mathcal{A}$ has a second order limit distribution). Hence, Corollary 33 implies that $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}$ has a second order limit $t$-distribution.

Since orthogonal matrices are unitary, any unitarily invariant ensemble is also orthogonally invariant. From Corollary 33, a unitarily invariant ensemble with a second order limit distribution also has a second order limit $t$-distribution, hence Theorem 9 and Corollary 33 implies the following

**Corollary 35.** *If $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ are two independent ensembles of random matrices such that $\mathcal{A}_1$ is unitarily invariant and has a second order limit distribution and $\mathcal{A}_2$ has a second order limit $t$-distribution, then $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ are asymptotically real second order free.*

*Remark* 36. Some relevant classes of unitarily invariant ensembles of random matrices (namely complex Gaussian and Wishart) are described in [M], [MS], [MSS]. Moreover, in [MSS] it is shown that a unitarily invariant ensemble of random matrices with a second order limit distribution is asymptotically *complex* second order free from any independent ensemble of random matrices with a second order limit distribution. This result, together with Corollary 21 imply that unitarily invariant ensembles of random matrices with a second order limit distribution are *both real and complex* second order free from any independent ensemble of random matrices with a second order limit distribution (see also [MP] Section 10). Particularly, the following relation (under a weaker form also mentioned in [MP], Section 10) holds true.

*Proposition* 37. *If* $\mathcal{A} = \{A_N, B_N\}_N$ *is an ensemble of random matrices such that* $\sup_{N\to\infty} |\operatorname{E}(\operatorname{Tr}(AB))| < \infty$ *and* $\sup_{N\to\infty} |\operatorname{E}(\operatorname{Tr}(A)\operatorname{Tr}(B))| < \infty$, *and* $\{U_N\}_N$ *is an ensemble of Haar unitary matrices independent from* $\mathcal{A}$, *then*

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \operatorname{E}\left(\operatorname{tr}(UAU^*(UBU^*)^t)\right) = 0.$$

*Proof.* Denote $A = (a_{i,j})_{i,j=1}^N$ and $B = (b_{i,j})_{i,j=1}^N$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\operatorname{E}(\operatorname{tr}(UAU^*(UBU^*)^t)) \\
&= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\substack{1\le i_k\le N \\ 1\le |k|\le 4}} \operatorname{E}(u_{i_1,i_{-1}} a_{i_{-1},i_{-2}} \overline{u_{i_2,i_{-2}}} u_{i_3,i_{-3}} b_{i_{-3},i_{-4}} \overline{u_{i_4,i_{-4}}}) \\
&= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\substack{1\le i_k\le N \\ 1\le |k|\le 4}} \operatorname{E}(a_{i_{-1},i_{-2}} b_{i_{-3},i_{-4}}) \cdot \operatorname{E}(u_{i_1,i_{-1}} \cdot u_{i_3,i_{-3}} \cdot \overline{u_{i_2,i_{-2}}} \cdot \overline{u_{i_4,i_{-4}}}).
\end{aligned}$$

From Theorem 10, the right-hand side summand cancels unless $(i_{-1}, i_{-3}) \in \{(i_{-2}, i_{-4}), (i_{-4}, i_{-2})\}$. If $(i_{-1}, i_{-3}) = (i_{-2}, i_{-4})$, then from Remark 6 and Theorem 10, the right-hand side of the above equation equals

$$\frac{1}{N} \operatorname{E}(\operatorname{Tr}(A)\operatorname{Tr}(B)) \sum_{\substack{1\le i_k\le N \\ 1\le |k|\le 4}} \operatorname{E}(u_{i_1,j} \cdot u_{i_3,k} \overline{u_{i_2,j}} \cdot \overline{u_{i_4,k}}) = O(N^{-1}).$$

Similarly, if $(i_{-1}, i_{-3}) = (i_{-4}, i_{-2})$, then the summation equals

$$\frac{1}{N} \operatorname{E}(\operatorname{Tr}(AB)) \sum_{\substack{1\le i_k\le N \\ 1\le |k|\le 4}} \operatorname{E}(u_{i_1,j} \cdot u_{i_3,k} \overline{u_{i_2,j}} \cdot \overline{u_{i_4,k}}) = O(N^{-1}).$$

□

*Proposition* 38. *Suppose that $\mathcal{A}$ is a unitarily-invariant ensemble of random matrices that have a second order limit t-distribution. Then $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{A}^t = \{A^t : A \in \mathcal{A}\}$ are asymptotically real second order free.*

*In particular, if $U_N$ is a $N \times N$ Haar unitary random matrix, then $\{U_N, U_N^*\}_N$ and $\{U_N^t, \overline{U}_N\}$ are asymptotically real second order free.*

*Proof.* The asymptotic free independence of the ensembles $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{A}^t$ is shown in Corollary 29.

Let $\{U_N\}_N$ be an ensemble of Haar unitary random matrices independent from $\mathcal{A}$ (hence from $\mathcal{A}^t$) and denote by $\mathfrak{U}$ the ensemble $\{U_N, U_N^t, U_N^*, \overline{U}_N\}_N$.

Since $\mathcal{A}$ is unitarily invariant, any cumulant of traces of products of elements from $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{A}^t$ equals a cumulant of same order of traces of products of elements from $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{A}^t$ and $\mathfrak{U}$, which vanishes asymptotically from Theorem 24 (i.e. from the asymptotic real second order freeness of $\mathfrak{U}$ and $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}^t$).

It remains to prove that $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{A}^t$ satisfy equation (4). Let $A_1, \ldots, A_n$ and $B_1, \ldots, B_m$ be centered random matrices such that if $k$ is odd then $A_k, B_k \in \mathcal{A}$ and if $k$ is even then $A_k, B_k \in \mathcal{A}^t$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Tr}(A_1 A_2 \cdots A_n) &= \mathrm{Tr}(U A_1 U^* (U^*)^t A_2 U^t U A_3 \cdots) \\ &= \mathrm{Tr}(A_1 (U^t U)^* A_2 U^t U A_3 \cdots)\end{aligned}$$

where the last factors of the last product above are $(U^t U)^* A_n$ if $n$ is odd, respectively $A_n U^t U$ if $n$ is even.

Since $E(\mathrm{tr}(U^t U)) = 0$ and $E(\mathrm{tr}(U^t U (U^t U)^*)) = 1$, applying again Theorem 24 we obtain

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \Big\{ \mathrm{cov}(\mathrm{Tr}(A_1 A_2 \cdots A_n), \mathrm{Tr}(B_1, B_2 \cdots B_m)) - \delta_{m,n} \cdot \sum_{k=1}^{n} \Big[ \prod_{i=1}^{n} \mathrm{tr}(A_i \cdot B_{k-i}) + \prod_{i=1}^{n} \mathrm{tr}(A_i \cdot B_{i-k}^t) \Big] \Big\} = 0$$

hence the conclusion.

Moreover, from Remark 36, $\lim_{N\to\infty} \mathrm{tr}(A_l \cdot B_k) = 0$ for all $l$ and $k$, therefore $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{A}^t$ are *not complex second order free.* □

*It is an open question at this moment if there exist $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{B}$ two ensembles of random matrices with a second order limit t-distribution such that $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are asymptotically complex second order free, but not real second order free.*

## References


[AGZ] G. Anderson, A. Guionnet, O. Zeitouni, *An Introduction to Random Matrices*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 2010.

[B] P. Biane, Representations of symmetric groups and free probability, *Adv. Math.*, **138** (1998), 126-181.

[CM] B. Collins and S. Matsumoto, On some properties of Orthogonal Weingarten functions, *J. Math. Phy.* **50** (2009), 113515.

[CS] B. Collins and P. Śniady, Integration with Respect to the Haar Measure on Unitary, Orthogonal, and Symplectic Group, *Comm. Math. Phy.*, **264** (2006), 773-795.

[$D_1$] F.J. Dyson, Statistical theory of the energy levels of complex systems. II. *J. Math. Phys.* **3** (1962), 157-165.

[$D_2$] F.J. Dyson, Statistical theory of the energy levels of complex systems. III. *J. Math. Phys.* **3** (1962), 166-172.

[M] M. L. Mehta, *Random Matrices* 2nd ed., Academic Press, 1991.

[MN] J. A. Mingo, A. Nica, Annular noncrossing permutations and partitions, and second-order asymptotics for random matrices. *Int. Math. Res. Not.* **2004**, no. 28, 1413-1460.

[MP] J. A. Mingo, M. Popa, Real second order freeness and Haar orthogonal matrices, *J. Math. Phys.* **54** (2013), no. 5, 051701, 35 pp.

[MSS] J. A. Mingo, R. Speicher, P. Sniady, Second Order Freeness and Fluctuations of Random Matrices: II. Unitary Random Matrices, *Adv. Math.* **209** (2007), no. 1, 212–240.

[MS] J. A. Mingo, R. Speicher, Second Order Freeness and Fluctuations of Random Matrices: I. Gaussian and Wishart matrices and Cyclic Fock spaces *J. Funct. Anal.* **235** (2006), no. 1, 226-270.

[MST] J. A. Mingo, R. Speicher, and E. Tan, Second Order Cumulants of Products, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **361**, (2009), 4751-4781.

[NS] A. Nica and R. Speicher, *Lectures on the Combinatorics of Free Probability*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 2006.

[R] C. E. I. Redelmeier, Real second-order freeness and the asymptotic real second-order freeness of several real matrix ensembles, *Int. Math. Res. Not.* **2014**, no. 12, pp. 3353-3395.

[$V_1$] D.-V. Voiculescu, Limit laws for random matrices and free products, *Invent. Math.* **104** (1991), no. 1, 201-220.

[$V_2$] D.-V. Voiculescu, A strengthened asymptotic freeness result for random matrices with applications to free entropy, *Int. Math. Res. Not.*, **1998**, no. 1, 41-63.

[VDN] D.-V. Voiculescu, K. J. Dykema, A. Nica, *Free random variables. A noncommutative probability approach to free products with applications to random matrices, operator algebras and harmonic analysis on free groups.* CRM Monograph Series, vol. 1, Amer. Math. Soc., 1992.

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Queen's University, Jeffery Hall, Kingston, Ontario, K7L 3N6, Canada
*E-mail address*: mingo@mast.queensu.ca

The University of Texas at San Antonio, Department of Mathematics, One UTSA Circle, San Antonio, Texas 78249, and
Institute of Mathematics "Simion Stoilow" of the Romanian Academy, P.O. Box 1-764, Bucharest, RO-70700, Romania
*E-mail address*: Mihai.Popa@utsa.edu